DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 016 JC 980 415

AUTHOR	Sydow, Debbie L.
TITLE	Outcomes of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative: 1993-1998.
INSTITUTION	Mountain Empire Community Coll., Big Stone Gap, VA.
PUB DATE	1998-02-00
NOTE	124p.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Educational Research; Evaluation Methods; *Improvement Programs; Learning; *Outcomes of Education; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; Surveys; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Virginia Community College System

ABSTRACT

This is a study of the outcomes of the professional development initiative implemented in 1993 by the Virginia Community College System (VCCS). It attempts to answer the question of whether faculty participation in structured professional development activities results in significant improvements in teaching. The primary objective of the study was to evaluate the actual effects of the initiative and to determine: (1) the extent to which these effects addressed the documented professional development needs of faculty, and; (2) the extent to which these effects resulted in enhanced student learning. Reported are the results of a 5-year follow-up survey of the professional development activities and needs of VCCS faculty. Included are a literature review, methods and procedures, and research findings related to the professional development survey, peer group conferences, and research grants. Based on the research findings, recommendations for improved professional development programs include the use of conferences, workshops, seminars and other short-term, focused meetings as a means of educating faculty. Appended are brief guidelines for facilitating meetings, research grant information, surveys and forms, and time-management data. (Contains 15 references) (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 016

Outcomes of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative: 1993-1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. L. Sydow
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Report Prepared by Dr. Debbie L. Sydow
February, 1998

JC980415

Contents

Introduction	page 3
Literature Review	page 3
The VCCS Professional Development Initiative	page 6
Methods and Procedures	page 8
Professional Development Survey	page 9
Peer Group Conferences	page 9
Research Grants	page 11
Research Findings	page 12
Professional Development Survey	page 12
Peer Group Conferences	page 28
Research Grants	page 36
Recommendations	page 46
Conclusion	page 48
Works Cited	page 50
Appendices	page 52

Introduction

There exists abundant information concerning the structure and organization of professional development programs that have been implemented in colleges and universities throughout the country, but scarce data exist to measure program effectiveness. Professional development programs tend to be developed for a common purpose, that is, to maintain the professional vitality and productivity of faculty and other academic professionals who are responsible for fostering student learning. However, the large question remains. Does faculty participation in structured professional development activities result in real improvements in teaching and learning? A study of the outcomes of the professional development initiative implemented in 1993 by the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) attempts to answer this question.

Literature Review

A literature review conducted prior to publication of the 1993 report by the VCCS Professional Development Task Force, A Plan For Revitalization (Sydow, 1993), revealed that empirically acquired knowledge on the topic of professional development is scant. And a review of literature published since 1992 confirmed that the status remains relatively unchanged. Knowledge about professional development has been created largely through accounts of personal experience, not by experimental testing. O'Banion (1997) explains this in part by noting, "Even in the best of circumstances—the best-trained staff using the best instruments in the most controlled situation—assessment is far from being an exact science, especially when applied to individuals. For assessment to 'work'

for the individual learner . . . the process must be framed around the needs of the learner" (p. 91).

In a review of research on effective professional development methods, Maxwell and Kazlauskas (1992) identified community college professional development programs that effectively encouraged instructor participation and improved teaching skills. They found that the most effective programs were those geared toward improving the subject knowledge and research skills of faculty. Grant projects designed to improve and update classroom activities and instruction, for example, were viewed as highly effective, particularly those projects geared toward the faculty member's own area of expertise or knowledge. With regard to workshops or conferences, researchers concluded that the effectiveness of these professional development activities should be based on actual outcomes as perceived by participants. Further, Maxwell and Kazlauskas found that programs which offer workshops in instructional technology, faculty exchange programs with other institutions, travel funds, attendance at professional meetings, and temporary course load reductions all contribute to effective instructional development (p. 357).

Another research review conducted by Burnstad (1994) supported the notion that successful professional development programs must be comprehensive, offering a wide range of development opportunities, such as mini-grants, mentoring, resource centers, consortiums, and workshops, conferences and seminars. Burnstad concluded that any development program must be constituent driven, supported by the administration, managed by a staff developer, adequately funded, periodically evaluated, and it must "advance the mission of the college through a student-centered, research-driven approach" (p. 389). Similarly, Mott (1994) maintained that successful professional development

programs must (1) include all employees, (2) address the long-range needs of all involved, and (3) have financial commitment. And Schwandt (1996) identified financial support and resources, as well as a common vision among faculty and administrators, as factors that enhance a professional development program (p. 310). These researchers found common elements that are characteristic of successful professional development programs, but they did not present program evaluation models.

In what was perhaps the most quantitative of all the studies reviewed, Harnish and Wild (1992) examined actual benefits brought about by implementation of a five-year instructional improvement grant. The researchers chose interviews as their research technique because of the broad nature of the instrument "to capture and communicate the diverse experience of faculty participants and to determine what difference the project had made to them and their teaching" (p. 22). Basically, Harnish and Wild sought to identify what motivated faculty to participate in professional development activities, and what perceived impact participation in these activities had made in their classrooms and in their professional lives. They concluded that the program resulted in significant gains for the instructors, their students, and the institution. Gains included increased sharing among colleagues, improved student satisfaction, curriculum improvements, increased subject knowledge for instructors, updated skills, as well as new materials for the classroom. These findings were the direct reports and observations of faculty about their own students' progress.

The literature review did not present a single program evaluation model that could be applied to the present study; however, it did suggest approaches, such as participant interviews, that informed the methodology of this study. The literature review also

yielded information about various professional development activities and program components that have consistently been perceived by faculty as effective.

The VCCS Professional Development Initiative

The Virginia Community College System, which employs nearly 2,000 full-time faculty and serves more than 220,000 students (75,000 full-time equivalent students) at 23 colleges (35 campuses), faces many of the challenges common to higher education at the end of the 20th century, including increased accountability, rapid technological advancement, changing enrollment patterns, declining financial resources, and an aging faculty. To prevent these harsh fiscal, social and demographic realities from accelerating problems such as faculty burn out, inertia and loss of productivity in teaching and learning, the VCCS looked to professional development as a means of maintaining optimal faculty vitality and productivity, and optimal student learning. The Chancellor of the VCCS convened a task force in 1992 to study professional development in the system and to recommend a plan of action.

Findings of the 1992 study, which included a literature review, an analysis of model professional development programs, and a survey of the professional development activities and needs of Virginia's community college faculty, revealed that there existed virtually no systemwide support for professional development, and fewer than half of the system's 23 colleges (43%) reported having a professional development program in place—the majority of those programs were still in the formative stages. Lack of time, funding, and support were identified by faculty as barriers to professional development. The VCCS Professional Development Initiative proposed by the task force was designed

and implemented to eliminate these barriers and to create an environment conducive to continual growth and learning at every college in the system, for a precept of the Initiative is that faculty development results in enhanced student learning.

Research findings indicated, and the task force recommended, that a coordination of effort on the part of faculty, the colleges, and the system would be required for the success of a comprehensive professional development plan. Each stakeholder was found to have a particular role to play in bringing about the goal of sustained vitality. Individuals would have to be responsible for their continued professional growth, but, at the same time, institutions and the system would be required to provide conditions conducive to professional growth and sustained vitality. Recommendations presented in the report submitted by the VCCS professional development task force (Sydow, 1993) were based on the premise that the goal of professional development could best be accomplished through common purpose, joint effort and mutual responsibility among individual faculty, the colleges, and the VCCS.

The Chancellor accepted the task force's recommendations, and in 1993 the State Board for Community Colleges in Virginia approved the Chancellor's recommendation to implement a comprehensive, statewide professional development initiative. The Initiative provides support for all areas of professional development—discipline, instructional, career and organizational development. Headed by a full-time director under the guidance of a systemwide committee, the Initiative requires that each college maintain a comprehensive professional development program; it encourages and supports faculty to maintain individual development plans; and it provides eight statewide, system-supported programs that contribute time, funding and support for professional development. These

programs include Peer Group Conferences, Research Grants, Teleconferences, Minority Faculty Recruitment, Leadership Seminars, Classified Staff Development, Technology Skills Certification, and Regional Teaching Excellence Centers.

Since its implementation in 1993, the VCCS Professional Development Initiative has won national recognition awards, including the prestigious Hesburgh Certificate of Excellence and the National Bellwether Award. Over the past five years, the VCCS has dedicated $500,000 annually and a total of $2.5 million to the Initiative, the stated goal of which is to enhance student learning through an ongoing investment in the professional vitality and productivity of faculty. To date, nearly every full-time faculty member in the VCCS, and many adjunct faculty, have availed themselves of the abundant opportunities made possible through the Initiative to strengthen and renew the professoriate and to advance student learning.

Methods and Procedures

The results of a five-year follow-up survey of the professional development activities and needs of VCCS faculty are reported in this study. For the purpose of triangulation, two of the most expansive and expensive program components—peer group conferences ($200,000 annual allocation) and research grants ($200,000 annual allocation)—are reviewed and evaluated using widely accepted qualitative research methods. The primary objective of the study is to evaluate the actual effects of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative and to determine the extent to which these effects addressed the documented professional development needs of faculty and the extent to which these effects resulted in enhanced student learning.

Professional Development Survey

To determine the current status of professional development in the VCCS and, in essence, to measure the effectiveness of the Professional Development Initiative, the original, literature-based survey instrument administered in the fall of 1992 to all faculty in the VCCS was re-administered in the fall of 1997. The 1997 survey included an additional set of questions about specific components of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative. Also, based upon feedback received through a pilot survey, certain questions were reworded for clarity. Otherwise, the 1992 and 1997 survey instruments were identical; each included sets of questions concerning the following: current professional activities, individual professional development goals, institutional support, and demographic data. (See the 1993 report, A Plan for Revitalization, for a detailed discussion of how the original survey was designed and administered.)

Surveys from anonymous participants were returned by each college to the system office, numerical responses to survey questions were scanned into a computer data base for tabulation and analysis, and written comments to open-ended questions were typed and coded for analysis.

Peer Group Conferences

Peer group conferences are planned by discipline representatives convened by the VCCS Director of Professional Development, with logistical support provided by VCCS staff. The conferences are attended by faculty from throughout the VCCS who teach in the discipline. Participants in these annual or bi-annual meetings complete program

assessment forms at the end of the conference (see assessment form, Appendix 1). For the purposes of this study, completed assessment forms for each conference from the fall of 1993 through the spring of 1997 were reviewed to identify patterns in the immediate, post-conference attitudes of respondents, e.g., what they considered to be highlights of the conference, what was learned, and what changes should be effected to improve future meetings. Peer group conference programs or agendas from the same time period were also reviewed to ascertain the different themes, topics, and structures adopted by the various groups. Information obtained from these reviews was then used to plan the focus group research.

Although focus group research is time intensive—selecting questions and participants, contacting participants, coordinating dates and times for meetings, transcribing tapes, and analyzing results—focus groups were employed in this study to discover and document specific outcomes and measurable effects of peer group conference participation. The professional development survey provides general, quantitative information about participation in peer groups and the perceived effectiveness of this development activity; focus groups provide specific, qualitative information about the outcomes of participation.

Focus groups were used to identify the short-term and long-term effects of peer group conferences on faculty participants, specifically knowledge or skills gained that were subsequently applied in the classroom. Peer group participants from throughout the VCCS were identified by discipline, year of participation and college; they were then representatively selected to participate in focus groups of four to six faculty from each of the following disciplines: Engineering Technologies, Business Technologies, Allied Health,

Natural and Physical Sciences, and Arts and Humanities. These focus groups were led by a trained moderator and were conducted by conference call (see moderator's guide, Appendix 2).

Finally, a qualitative research software program, NUD•IST, was employed to identify themes that emerged in the focus groups. NUD•IST is a program designed for storage, coding, retrieval, and analysis of focus group transcripts. Transcripts from each focus group were loaded into NUD•IST, and the qualitative software was used to sort emergent patterns or themes related to peer group conferences and their effectiveness in contributing to improvements in teaching and learning. Traditional coding and analysis of transcripts was also employed.

Research Grants

To promote research and scholarship among faculty, a grant program was established as one component of the Initiative to provide up to $8,000 per semester to support faculty research and professional development in four areas: discipline, instructional, career and organizational development. All full-time faculty are eligible to apply for released time to complete a project and/or funding for project-related expenses. Proposals are reviewed by a subcommittee of the VCCS Professional Development Committee, which is comprised of faculty members from each institution in the 23-college System. In 1996, a catalog of project reports and abstracts was published by the VCCS Professional Development Committee in an effort to disseminate information about studies and findings, but no analysis of the findings or outcomes of grant-supported research had been conducted prior to the current study.

Grant recipients are required to submit a report that summarizes the results of their funded project; this report asks them about expected versus actual results and outcomes, as well as benefits realized as a result of having completed the project. For the purposes of this study, each grant proposal approved for funding (n = 326) and each final report (n = 190) was reviewed and sorted by development type, i.e., instructional, organizational, discipline, career (see proposal and report forms, Appendix 3). Of the 326 proposals reviewed, 57 percent were submitted for the purpose of instructional development, 21 percent for discipline development, 21 percent for organizational development, and 1 percent for career development. To gain insight into the variety of projects undertaken in each development category and the range of outcomes over the five-year period, the proposals and reports from ten percent of grants in each category were representatively selected and loaded into NUD•IST for identification of patterns and themes related to outcomes of grant participation.

Research Findings

Professional Development Survey

Of the 2,688 questionnaires mailed to the colleges for distribution, 2,137 were completed and returned, yielding a total response rate of 80 percent, compared to a 75 percent response rate in the 1992 survey. Participation by institution was 100 percent, which means that responses from academic and administrative personnel at all twenty-three colleges are represented in the study. Demographic data of survey respondents of 1997 compared with respondents of 1992 are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographics of 1992 (n = 2,070) and 1997 (n = 2,137) Survey Respondents

	1992		*1997*	
	N	*%*	*N*	*%*
Gender				
Male	1,056	51.0	1,081	50.6
Female	905	43.7	962	45.0
Age				
Under 30	41	2.0	30	1.4
30-39	273	13.2	207	9.7
40-49	915	44.2	709	33.2
50-59	559	27.0	916	42.8
60 or over	178	8.6	194	9.1
Position Currently Held				
Administrator	308	14.9	372	17.4
Faculty	1,519	73.4	1,509	70.6
Counselor	91	4.4	117	5.5
Librarian	29	1.4	38	1.8
Other	37	1.8	28	1.3
Years in Current Position				
Less than one	126	6.1	67	3.1
1-5 years	534	25.8	483	22.6
6-10 years	323	15.6	391	18.3
11-20 years	635	30.7	491	23.0
Over 20 years	354	17.1	652	30.5
Courses Taught				
Transfer	807	39.0	859	40.2
Occupational/Technical	667	32.2	631	29.5
Does not apply	397	19.2	413	19.3
Highest Degree Held				
Doctoral degree	400	19.3	514	24
Master's + 24 or Specialist	584	28.2	607	28.4
Master's degree	747	36.1	727	34
Professional degree	54	2.6	44	2.1
Bachelor's degree	132	6.4	132	6.2

Note: Percentages do not always add up to 100 percent because missing and unreadable responses, which are not listed in the table, were calculated as part of the total.

The demographic data reveal similar survey populations in 1992 and 1997, with the exception of two related categories, age and years in current position. The percentage of respondents in 1992 who reported being under 50 years of age was 59.4 compared to 44.3 percent in 1997. Conversely, the percentage of respondents in 1992 who reported being 50 years of age or older was 35.6 percent compared to 51.9 percent in 1997. The number of respondents reporting having been in their current position for over 20 years nearly doubled in the five-year period between the two surveys, increasing from 17.1 in 1992 to 30.5 percent in 1997. These findings are consistent with the national trend toward an aging faculty.

Time spent participating in selected professional development activities varied little from 1992 to 1997, except with regard to seeking outside funding, conducting research, attending professional meetings, and recruiting students. In each of these activities, faculty reported spending more time in 1997 than they did five years prior. A full 10 percent more faculty in 1997 responded that they spend some time seeking outside funding, 8 percent more faculty spend some time conducting research and attending professional meetings, and 9 percent more faculty spend some time recruiting students. These increases, particularly in the areas of research and professional conferences, may be explained by the additional professional development opportunities made available to faculty through the VCCS Professional Development Initiative. The increased time spent seeking outside funding and recruiting may also be explained by increased pressures related to shrinking state funding. Table 2 indicates the number of hours per week that respondents in 1992 and 1997 reported spending on selected activities.

Table 2. Percent of Respondents Reporting Hours Spent Weekly on Selected Activities, 1992 & 1997

	0		*1-5*		*6-10*		*11-20*		*over 20*	
	'92	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*
Principal duties of position	0	.2	3	1	5	2	27	26	64	69
Activities related to teaching	8	9	16	16	24	24	32	31	19	19
Interacting with students outside of class	5	5	52	51	29	28	8	10	5	5
Interacting with colleagues informally	8	4	79	80	10	11	2	2	0	1
Committee work	19	12	70	77	8	7	2	1	0	0
Seeking outside funding	83	73	14	22	1	2	0	1	0	0
Conducting research	57	49	34	39	5	7	2	2	1	1
Professional meetings/conferences	40	32	56	61	3	3	0	1	0	0
Recruiting	61	52	35	41	2	4	1	1	0	0
Coursework toward degree	73	70	17	20	5	5	2	1	1	1
Giving speeches	71	68	27	27	1	1	0	0	0	0
Community service work	24	23	64	64	9	8	2	2	0	1
Activities solely to improve professional performance	45	32	51	62	2	3	0	1	0	0
Outside paid employment	68	73	19	17	6	5	3	2	4	1
Work for professional organization	56	53	41	41	2	2	0	1	0	0
Reading professional journals	9	10	79	79	9	7	1	1	1	1
Teaching overload (credit hours)	63	56	33	36	3	5	0	1	0	0
Interacting with outside agencies	35	30	54	54	7	9	2	3	1	1

Note: Percentages do not always add up to 100 percent because missing and unreadable responses, which are not listed in the table, were calculated as part of the total.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3. Percent Of Respondents Reporting # of Years Since Participating in Selected Activities, 1992 & 1997

	< or = 3		4-6		7-9		>or = 10		n/a	
	'92	'97	'92	'97	'92	'97	'92	'97	'92	'97
Conference Attendance	88	92	6	4	2	1	2	1	2	1
Educational Leave/Sabbatical	10	9	4	4	3	2	26	28	55	55
Scholarly contribution	36	37	10	10	5	6	18	19	30	28
Internship or exchange	11	14	3	4	2	2	19	20	62	58
Developed a new course	52	56	13	11	5	5	8	8	22	19
Revised course to reflect new developments in field	63	66	8	7	3	2	4	4	22	20
Revised course to reflect new developments in technology	*	62	*	6.5	*	2.1	*	4.0	*	25
Revised course to incorporate elements of general education	45	43	8	10	3	3	5	7	37	36
Completed credit course	38	32	17	16	12	11	26	32	6	9
Participated in an innovative teaching experiment	50	55	8	9	4	3	11	8	27	23
Had an article published	14	14	6	6	4	5	24	25	51	48
Contributed to a book	12	12	3	4	3	3	18	20	63	60
Applied to an outside agency for a research grant	14	18	4	5	3	3	17	16	61	55
Participated in planning a workshop or conference	58	64	9	9	6	4	8	8	49	14
Participated in a colloquy	46	53	7	9	4	3	9	9	32	25
Served on a professional committee outside the college	50	54	8	10	4	4	11	10	26	21

Note: Percentages do not always add up to 100 percent because missing and unreadable responses, which are not listed in the table, were calculated as part of the total. The asterisk (*) denotes information not gathered in the 1992 survey.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The 1997 survey results indicate that more faculty are attending conferences or professional meetings than in 1992, which undoubtedly results from increased funding for this development activity. Four percent (4%) more faculty reported having recently (within the past 3 years) attended a professional conference or workshop in their field in 1997 than in 1992. Similarly, 7 percent more respondents stated that they had recently (within the past 3 years) participated in a scheduled colloquy to discuss a professional issue, and 6 percent more said they had participated in the planning, organization, and/or offering of a workshop, conference, etc., in the same time period (See Table 3.)

Five percent (5%) more faculty reported having recently (within the past 3 years) participated in an innovative teaching experiment (e.g., team teaching, writing across the curriculum, computer-assisted instruction, etc.) in 1997 than in 1992. And 61.7 percent of 1997 faculty respondents said that within the past three years they had significantly revised a course on the basis of new developments in technology. This question was not included in the 1992 survey, so no comparison to previous findings can be provided. However, the rapid increase in technological development over the past five years, the tremendous gains in information infrastructure upgrades made possible at each college as the result of appropriations secured by the VCCS for technology upgrades in 1995-1997, and the increased expectation that faculty utilize technology to enhance student learning have certainly contributed to the large percentage of faculty who have recently integrated technology into the curriculum. The increased number of faculty (6% more in 1997 than in 1992) reporting that it has been 10 or more years since they completed a university credit course may be explained by data suggesting that more faculty are opting for workshops, conferences, and other professional meetings rather than lengthier, formal

courses to remain up-to-date in their fields. Table 3 provides detailed information about the percentage of respondents (1992 and 1997) reporting the number of years since participating in selected professional development activities.

The overwhelming majority of respondents indicated that they will pursue professional development in the upcoming year. Only 7.6 percent indicated no plans to participate in professional development in 1998, compared to 12 percent in 1992. When viewed in conjunction with the demographic data indicating that more respondents are older and have been in their positions longer, this low percentage of faculty with no plans to participate in professional development is even more noteworthy, for the late career stage tends to be a period of deceleration when faculty gradually withdraw interest from the college. Hall (1976) describes the shift in role that generally typifies this period by noting that one moves from a dynamic role of doer to one of supporter, guide, counselor, and advisor.

Despite the availability of research grants and other Initiative activities designed to provide released time and money for faculty to engage in professional development, these two factors—time (42.2 %) and money (23.2%)—were once again the predominant reasons stated for deciding "not to participate in a professional development activity that is available" (see survey instrument, Appendix 4). As was revealed from the peer group and research grant studies, some faculty perceive their teaching loads to be prohibitive to professional development. The dramatic increase in the availability of professional development activities brought about by the Initiative may also significantly contribute to the feeling that there simply is not enough time or money to participate in all "available" activities. Faculty are given many more professional development options, thus making it

possible to pick and choose—to customize—among a wide variety of development activities. Of note is the fact that 5 percent fewer respondents in 1997 cited lack of money as a reason for non-participation.

Table 4. Percent Of Respondents Indicating the Importance of Various Professional Development Goals, 1992 & 1997

	Unimportant/ Somewhat Unimportant		*Important/ Somewhat Important*		*Not a Goal*	
	'92	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*
Become more effective at job	1	1	99	98	0	0
Become more knowledgeable in field	2	1	97	98	0	0
Obtain a higher degree	21	19	40	32	38	45
Obtain a higher rank	16	15	55	46	29	34
Obtain an administrative position	24	22	14	12	58	58
Obtain a position at 4-yr. college or university	28	26	16	12	56	59
Obtain a position in a non-academic setting	27	25	11	10	62	61
Obtain a full-time teaching position (p/t only)	6	5	9	3	68	63

Nearly all respondents identified increased effectiveness in their jobs (98%) and increased knowledge in their respective fields (98%) as a "somewhat important" or "important" professional goal. Fewer respondents indicated that obtaining higher rank (46% in 1997 compared with 55% in 1992) or obtaining a higher degree (32% in 1997 compared with 40% in 1992) is "somewhat important" or "important." And only 12 percent (compared with 16% in 1992) of faculty respondents reported obtaining a position at a four-year college as a "somewhat important" or "important" professional development goal. Once again, the fact that nearly a third (30.5%) of respondents have held their

current position for more than 20 years may explain, in part, the decreased number of faculty respondents who rate obtaining higher rank, a higher degree, or a position outside the community college as a "somewhat important" or "important" goal. These goals tend to either be achieved or abandoned over time. (See Table 4.)

Respondents were asked to determine the likelihood of pursuing selected professional development activities if they were given the opportunity through funding, sabbatical or educational leave, or released time. Table 5 presents the professional development activities listed in the survey and respondents' "likelihood" of pursuing these activities, if given the opportunity. As in 1992, most respondents in 1997 indicated that they would be "likely" or "somewhat likely" to attend professional conferences, college-sponsored programs, non-credit courses, and formal colloquies or symposia, if time and

Table 5. % Of Respondents Indicating the Likelihood of Pursuing Various Activities if Given the Opportunity, 1992 & 1997

	Unlikely/ Somewhat Unlikely		*Likely/ Somewhat Likely*		*Does Not Apply*	
	'92	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*
University credit courses	28	38	66	57	5	4
Non-credit courses	35	28	61	68	3	2
Professional conferences	6	4	92	96	1	0
College-sponsored programs	10	6	87	93	1	0
Internship or exchange in business/industry	48	52	36	33	16	14
Academic exchange	56	58	35	34	9	6
Research and scholarship	45	43	49	52	6	4
Formal colloquies or symposia	38	31	56	65	5	3
Summer institutes, workshops, etc.	26	32	67	64	4	3

funds permitted. In fact, more respondents indicated an interest in each of these activities in 1997 than in 1992, which is consistent with the increased number of faculty stating they have recently participated in these activities (See Table 5). Also noteworthy is the indication throughout the survey that university credit courses are less appealing as a professional development option than they were five years ago; non-credit courses and less formal and/or time intensive options seem to be the current preference.

Table 6. Percent of Respondents Rating the Effectiveness of Various Activities for Keeping Up-to-date and/or Improving Performance

	Ineffective/ Somewhat Ineffective		*Effective/ Somewhat Effective*		*Have not pursued*	
	'92	'97	'92	'97	'92	'97
University credit courses	19	20	64	60	15	19
Non-credit courses	18	13	60	68	21	18
Professional conferences	6	5	90	93	3	2
College-sponsored programs	22	15	70	82	6	2
Internship or exchange in business/industry	9	8	36	34	53	57
Research and scholarship	13	11	54	58	32	30
Site visits	10	8	65	67	24	23
Formal colloquies or symposia with colleagues	13	11	60	69	24	19
Informal conversations with colleagues	9	7	89	90	2	1
Professional journals	6	6	91	90	2	3
Professional committee or task force work	25	25	59	63	15	10
Teleconferences	22	28	45	46	32	24
Computer networks	18	15	33	64	47	19

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In keeping with findings of the earlier study, conferences, informal conversation with colleagues, professional journals, and college-sponsored programs were reported as most effective for keeping faculty up-to-date with new developments and for improving their professional performance; 93 percent of respondents found conferences to be "somewhat effective" or "effective" (See Table 6). More respondents in 1997 rated non-credit courses (68% in 1997; 60% in 1992), college-sponsored programs (82% in 1997; 70% in 1992), formal colloquies or symposia with colleagues (69% in 1997; 60% in 1992), and computer networks (64% in 1997; 33% in 1992) as effective for keeping them up-to-date and improving their performance. Clearly, advances in the VCCS infrastructure and increasing demands to utilize technology for instruction explain the fact that nearly twice as many respondents cited computer networks as an effective professional development resource. And even these numbers may understate the impact of technology, given the fact that the two largest colleges in the VCCS had the least computing capability at faculty desktops until late 1997.

Over three-fourths (76.6%) of all respondents reported that the administration at their institutions either "mildly" or "strongly" encourages professional development, an increase of nearly 10 percent over the 1992 study in which only 67.1 percent of respondents reported that their institutions encouraged professional development. Clearly, the well-focused and well-funded commitment to professional development demonstrated by the VCCS Professional Development Initiative has positively affected the commitment to professional development at the college level.

More than half (58 %) of respondents (compared with 43% in 1992) "strongly" or "mildly" agreed that sufficient opportunities for professional development are made

available by their institution. All other aspects of institutional environment addressed in the survey, such as morale, collegiality, and intellectual environment, remained relatively unchanged in terms of participant responses. (See Table 7.)

Table 7. Percent of Respondents Rating Various Aspects of Institutional Environment, 1992 & 1997

	Strongly or Mildly Disagree		*Strongly or Mildly Agree*		*Neutral*	
	'92	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*	*'92*	*'97*
Morale in this institution is generally high	46	48	50	48	3	2
There is a sense of community here	33	38	64	58	2	1
Professionals here respect each other	19	20	78	76	2	2
There is a sense of collegiality here	29	29	66	66	3	2
Efforts to try new approaches to meet job demands are generally supported	29	28	63	66	7	3
Faculty & administration are typically at odds	52	47	40	45	6	5
An intellectual environment exists here	34	30	62	65	3	3
Sufficient opportunities for professional development are made available	50	37	43	58	6	2
Professionals here are appreciated by supervisors for doing their jobs well	30	31	66	64	3	2

In rating the adequacy of financial support made available by colleges for selected professional development activities, 71 percent of respondents (15% answered "does not apply") indicated that their college provides "adequate" or "somewhat adequate" training in computer skills, a 31% increase over the 1992 response. Similarly, 45 percent rated funding for retraining for fields significantly affected by rapidly changing technology to be "adequate" or "somewhat adequate," compared to 28 percent in 1992. It would appear

that college administrators have recognized and are responding to the increased need for faculty professional development in technology-specific areas. (See Table 8.)

More 1997 respondents reported satisfaction with funding provided by their colleges for tuition reimbursement, sabbaticals, educational leave, released time, flexible scheduling to accommodate individual professional development activities, and professional association membership fees. Nonetheless, faculty still indicated some funding inadequacies in each listed activity, which is to be expected given that funds are, and, unfortunately, are likely always to be, limited.

Table 8. Percent of Respondents Rating the Adequacy of Their Institution's Financial Support for Various Activities, 1992 & 1997

	Inadequate/ Somewhat Inadequate		*Adequate/ Somewhat Adequate*		*Does Not Apply*	
	'92	'97	'92	'97	'92	'97
Tuition reimbursement	40	39	44	47	13	10
Sabbaticals	49	40	19	32	29	24
Educational leave	45	37	32	39	20	20
Released time	49	45	34	42	14	9
Flexible scheduling to accommodate individual professional development activities	34	30	53	61	10	5
Professional association memberships (fees)	61	65	20	24	15	9
Registration fees for professional meetings	36	41	54	54	7	2
Travel expenses for professional meetings	40	45	50	50	8	2
Retraining for fields significantly affected by rapidly changing technology	44	39	28	45	24	12
Training in computer skills	39	23	40	71	17	15

Of significance is the fact that a greater percentage of 1997 respondents rated their institutions' financial support for all but two professional development activities listed to be "adequate" or "somewhat adequate," and for those two activities, registration fees and travel expenses, the percentages remained the same. (See Table 8.)

Participation in system sponsored professional development activities has consistently increased since 1993, the year in which many of these activities, including research grants, peer group conferences, technology skills certification, and individual development plans, were initiated. 731 respondents (34.2%) reported having participated in a peer group conference in 1996, more than twice the number (n = 354) reported in

Table 9. Participation, By Year, In Various Professional Development Activities

	1993		*1994*		*1995*		*1996*		*1997*	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
VCCS Research Grant	43	2.0	72	3.4	109	5.1	103	4.8	105	4.9
Peer Group Conference(s)	354	16.6	505	23.6	700	32.7	731	34.2	568	26.6
Local teleconference	166	7.8	261	12.2	432	20.2	525	24.6	391	18.3
Instructional or Administrative Leaders Seminar	96	4.5	97	4.5	143	6.7	161	7.5	128	6.0
New Horizons Conference	185	8.7	242	11.3	295	13.8	331	15.5	359	16.8
VCCS Technology Skills Certification Program	7	.3	10	.5	16	.7	130	6.1	177	8.3
Individual Development Plan	205	9.6	299	14.0	446	20.9	584	27.3	568	26.6

Note: Respondents were instructed to leave blank if they had not participated in the activity.

1993 (1997 data is incomplete because the survey was administered in September of 1997). Likewise, reported participation in research grants, teleconferences, New Horizons, technology skills certification, and individual development planning doubled or

tripled from 1993 to 1996 (see Table 9). Actual numbers of participants in these activities, available from the VCCS Professional Development Director's office, confirm large increases in the number of participants in VCCS sponsored activities over the five-year period.

As is shown in Table 10, the perceived effectiveness of professional development offerings made available through the VCCS Professional Development Initiative varies from activity to activity, with the majority of respondents (n = 1,250) rating peer group conferences as "effective" or "somewhat effective." Only 424 respondents reported not having pursued peer group conferences, the lowest number for any activity listed in the survey; this supports previous findings indicating greater participation in professional conferences than in any other professional development activity.

Table 10. Effectiveness of VCCS Professional Development Offerings

	Ineffective/ Somewhat Ineffective		*Effective/ Somewhat Effective*		*Have Not Pursued*	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
VCCS Research Grant award recipient	152	7.2	363	17.0	1,195	55.9
Peer Group Conference(s) in my discipline	176	8.3	1,250	58.4	424	19.8
Teleconference on campus or in region	354	16.5	763	35.7	660	30.9
Instructional or Administrative Leaders Seminar	120	5.7	443	20.7	1,091	51.0
New Horizons Conference	111	5.2	733	34.3	880	41.2
VCCS Technology Skills Certification	108	5.1	280	13.1	1,224	57.2
Individual Development Plan	237	11.1	789	36.9	694	32.5

The majority of respondents rated each VCCS sponsored activity in which they had participated as "effective" or "somewhat effective." Actual ratings of "somewhat

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ineffective" or "ineffective" for listed activities were remarkably low, with the exception of teleconferences, which were rated by 354 respondents (16.5%) as "somewhat ineffective" or "ineffective." Even so, 763 respondents (35.7%) rated teleconferences as "somewhat effective" or "effective." (See Table 10.)

In an effort to identify the long-term, direct and indirect benefits realized as a result of involvement in various VCCS professional development activities, faculty were asked to indicate specific outcomes of each activity in which they had participated. With the exception, again, of teleconferences (324 attributed no benefit to participation in teleconferences), relatively few respondents reported no direct, long-term benefit from participation in VCCS professional development activities.

Table 11. Long-term, Direct or Indirect Benefits Realized as a Result of Involvement in VCCS Professional Development Activities

	Improved Classroom Instruction		*Professional Reinvigoration*		*Enhanced Student Learning*		*No Benefit*		*Other*	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
VCCS Research Grant	236	11.0	220	10.3	193	9.0	96	4.5	85	4.0
Peer Group Conference(s)	646	30.2	1,111	52.0	521	24.4	123	5.8	48	2.2
Local teleconference	196	9.2	480	22.5	183	8.6	324	15.2	53	2.5
Instructional or Administrative Leaders Seminar	144	6.7	388	18.1	116	5.4	107	5.0	56	2.6
New Horizons Conference	337	15.8	614	28.7	286	13.4	109	5.1	55	2.6
VCCS Technology Skills Certification Program	112	5.2	167	7.8	79	3.7	134	6.3	65	3.0
Individual Development Plan	335	15.7	543	25.4	249	11.6	199	9.3	63	2.9

Note: Respondents were instructed to leave blank if they had not participated in the activity.

More than half (n = 1,111) of the respondents reported professional reinvigoration and renewal as a direct outcome of participating in peer group conferences, and 646 (30.2%) cited improved classroom instruction and 521 (24.4%) indicated enhanced student learning as a benefit of peer group participation. Also, a number of respondents reported direct benefits in the form of professional reinvigoration, improved teaching/learning, and other positive outcomes as a result of participation in research grants, instructional and administrative leaders seminars, the New Horizons conference, the technology skills certification program, individual development planning, and even teleconferences. Other positive outcomes cited by respondents as resulting from participation in these activities included increased discipline knowledge, increased skill levels, and personal improvement. (See Table 11.)

Overall, survey findings strongly indicate that significant long-term benefits have resulted from faculty participation in various activities made possible through the implementation and continuation of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative. The overwhelming majority (81.2%) of faculty respondents said they believe the VCCS Professional Development Initiative has been successful in providing greater support for professional development throughout the twenty-three colleges in the Virginia Community College System.

Peer Group Conferences

Since 1993, 1,803 full-time faculty and 91 adjunct faculty* have participated in peer group conferences. Peer group conferences were established as a component of the VCCS

* Due to multiple meeting attendance of participants, these numbers are not unduplicated.

Professional Development Initiative in an effort to address the problem of professional isolation identified in early studies. Intended to encourage intra-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary collaboration and problem-solving in the VCCS, each peer group, typically comprised of faculty from a single discipline, or, in some cases, related disciplines, meets every other year (with full funding) or every year (with partial funding) to discuss curriculum revision, integration of technology, instructional innovations, discipline updates, and other substantive issues. The typically two-day conferences are planned and facilitated by a planning committee made up of representatives from the peer group. The agenda is developed by peer group members, not administrators from colleges or the System Office.

In a recent review of participant reactions to peer group conferences, Black (1997) found that participants from a wide range of disciplines rated the meetings "good" or "excellent" for providing the opportunity for personal renewal, enhancement of professional effectiveness, and interaction among colleagues. The meetings were also rated high in their usefulness for update and innovation. The present study, in part, confirms these findings; faculty from various disciplines expounded on the usefulness of peer group conferences for establishing collegial networks and for gathering information and ideas; however, focus groups revealed that these are intermediate, not primary, gains. Primary gains occur by way of direct application of techniques, products and information in the classroom.

Each of five focus groups comprised of faculty from engineering technologies, business technologies, allied health, natural and physical sciences, and arts and humanities cited specific classroom applications resulting from participation in peer group

conferences. A physics professor discovered a new and engaging way to demonstrate diffusion to his students, business and other faculty were introduced to software that they subsequently adopted for classroom use, and H/VAC instructors learned about a new refrigerant that will replace the old standard and passed this on to their students whose textbooks had not yet caught up with industry change. Many faculty derived immediate benefit from adopting or modifying assignments, course outlines and other teaching materials picked up at peer group meetings, then implementing the materials in their classes. As one focus group participant stated:

> I pick up something from every session I go to. It might be a collaborative learning technique; it might be ideas about assignments or approaches that have worked well . . . I have changed my textbook because of a discussion of textbooks. I have probably found four or five videos that were discussed at conferences that I now use in class. I learned how to use basic WordPerfect to achieve some of the learning goals of freshman composition . . . With almost every session, I've come back with one or two things to try.

Much of the enthusiasm about peer group conferences that was conveyed in the focus groups seemed to result from the practical and immediate benefit of being able to obtain useful and usable information, ideas, and materials to implement in the classroom.

Focus group participants shared stories about how connections made with colleagues, outside presenters, vendors, and industry representatives had resulted in direct student gains. Faculty contacts with industry representatives have, according to focus group participants, resulted in donated equipment to college programs, new internships, and even jobs for students. One faculty member said that she met a person at a peer group

conference who inspired and assisted her to develop a student club—the African-American History club. Another learned about field trip opportunities for her students. And participants cited everything from presentation software modules to Internet resources to distance education courses as technology-specific finds that they brought directly back to the classroom.

> A fellow from NVCC talked about how he had offered his physics class through distance learning. After the meeting I talked to him about it, and I was able to do it this summer. Basically, he just sent me his materials, and I just did a little bit of changing to make it fit my situation here as far as the lab and this time frame for the summer and just did it without having to go back and re-invent the wheel, and it worked fine. That was a great opportunity to get something that somebody else had done all the hard work for and gone through all the development, and it was ready to go, and he said, "Sure, you can use it. I'll just send it over."

Often expressed as "networking," focus group participants cited the interaction and connections with colleagues and others attending the peer group meetings as a benefit; however, further discussion revealed that the interaction and connections, in most cases, served the more fundamental purpose of contributing to enhancements in teaching and learning.

Focus groups repeated in a variety of ways the invaluable experience of getting together with peers to share ideas, concerns and methods for resolving curricular problems:

> I met someone from PHCC, and since our meeting she and I have compared notes numerous times on different aspects of our curriculum, such as keyboarding and

the speeds and what we're each requiring in our classes, and certainly I think that the most valuable part of these meetings is to be able to compare what we're doing and what is working and what isn't working with those who are teaching similar subjects.

* * *

I'm in a very small college, and I'm the only full-time science professor at that college, so it's extremely valuable to me to talk with other colleagues in the same discipline.

* * *

It's been very helpful . . . to discuss the organizations that we sponsor, such as Collegiate Secretaries International. We get some new and fresh ideas, not just about curriculum, but in other ways that we support our students.

* * *

The sharing between colleagues is an excellent way to begin something new in your field, to meet new people in your discipline, to meet people who have more experience than you have, to meet people who have had similar problems and who have solved them.

Comparing peer group conferences to other professional conferences attended, the humanities focus group agreed that the former are more practical—"It's just the atmosphere that helps so much in terms of taking it back to the students because our focus in so student oriented from the start." Community college faculty are well known for their strong commitment to teaching and to their students; therefore, it is not surprising that peer group conferences have proven to be such a popular and valuable component of the

VCCS Professional Development Initiative. As one focus group participant stated, "When I'm at these meetings and I get input, I usually get it because I'm considering making changes in the classroom . . . It comes back to the whole area of assessment and making improvements in the classroom and in student learning . . . We are trying continually, I think, to look at what we do and make those improvements."

Without exception, focus group participants expressed strong support for the continuation of peer group conferences. In general, they found the meetings to be well planned and well implemented. Many expressed satisfaction with the interdisciplinary meeting approach, for example, all the natural science faculty meeting together rather than separating out biology, chemistry, etc. Most participants said they like the general meeting format of keynote addresses, concurrent sessions, and unstructured time to assimilate new ideas; however, preferences varied by discipline to some extent. As might be expected, business technologies faculty found software demonstrations to be indispensable, humanities faculty valued roundtable discussions, and engineering technologies faculty were stimulated by industry updates and exhibits.

Despite general satisfaction with the content and delivery of peer group conferences, suggestions for improvement were offered, with the consensus being that funding should be provided for annual meetings in every discipline cluster, with in-between meetings—perhaps sponsored by the colleges or the new Teaching Excellence regional centers—made possible through technology (computer conferencing, electronic mail, network conferencing, etc.). Many believed that these brief, electronically delivered, in-between meetings would stimulate more involvement of both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty who, in many cases, will not travel to the longer annual or bi-annual

conferences because of lost class time. Several peer groups have scheduled weekend meetings to minimize missed classes; however, lost class time remained a primary concern among participants.

> We cannot afford to lose, as far as continuity is concerned, even one or two days of class. I find it very difficult sometimes to get away for such meetings.

* * *

> I think that one of the best things about the [conference] in Roanoke was that it was on the weekend. That is, although we hate to give up weekend time, that's about all the time we have. Missing a couple of classes is hard to do. It's not easy to miss classes because you have to make up the work or figure some other way to cover the material. Even if the money is taken care of, the time is not; you know, there's only so much time . . .

Focus group participants expressed the need to receive more advanced notice (at least a semester in advance) about upcoming peer group meetings in order to appropriately plan and accommodate their class schedules and the working schedules of adjunct faculty. They suggested the distribution of preliminary fliers or announcements listing dates only (information about lodging and even location, which takes longer to finalize, need not be cited) for the next semester's or the next year's peer group conferences.

The focus group consensus was that due to their increasingly important contributions to the overall delivery and quality of community college instruction, adjunct faculty participation in all peer group conferences should be encouraged and increased. "[Adjunct faculty] represent such a large percentage now of the faculty of the VCCS, and I think the peer conferences is one of the few things that we do that supports and enhances

their interaction with full-time faculty and gives them the chance not only to meet other faculty members but to participate in the conference programs." Several focus group participants said they had gotten to know adjunct faculty from their own campuses for the first time at a peer group conference. "Our schedules are different, they're in different buildings, and they're mostly here at night. It's ironic, but we don't even get to meet our part-timers here at the school until we go to a meeting with them."

Other suggestions for improvement included inviting employers to talk about the knowledge and skills they expect of community college graduates and inviting university representatives to talk about articulation and transfer issues. Some participants believed site visits, either of other campuses or businesses and industries, would be beneficial; it was even suggested that the conferences be held on different college campuses. In addition, offering more hands-on workshops and demonstrations was cited as a desired change, as was more structured conference time (through roundtables, working lunches, etc.) for colleagues to discuss how to assimilate and apply new knowledge and techniques to classroom instruction. Student representation on peer group planning committees and/or planned programs was also suggested.

In general, focus group findings support survey findings; both suggest that peer group conferences are highly desirable and highly effective for faculty professional development. To cite one focus group participant:

> I think [peer group conferences] are one of the most important things we've done in the area of professional development. It gives faculty the opportunity to come together and share thoughts from across the system, to pick up ideas and good practices from other schools. It's a relatively inexpensive way to allow faculty to

share those thoughts and ideas, and I particularly like the idea that we've opened it up to some adjunct faculty. So I would rate it a number 10 on a 10-point scale. I think they are great. I would hope that we continue to do [peer group conferences].

According to the findings of this study, peer group conferences are wanted and needed by VCCS faculty, so the continuation and growth of this program component is essential.

Research Grants

Findings of the 1993 study of professional development in the VCCS were consistent with national data suggesting that community college faculty spend relatively little time conducting research (Sydow, p. 34). Teaching has long stood as the primary mission of the community college, which explains, at least in part, the extremely strong commitment to teaching and the comparatively weak commitment to research typically expressed by community college faculty. Unfortunately, the perception seems to be that teaching precludes research (Seidman, 1985; Block, 1991; Vaughan, 1991; Palmer, 1991; Palmer & Vaughan, 1992; Vaughan, 1997), a perception that not only threatens ongoing pedagogical development but also hinders community college faculty from disseminating, through scholarship and publication, their huge intellectual capital. To provide incentive and encouragement for scholarship, research grants were established as a component of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative, and more than 350 grants totaling nearly $1 million have been awarded since 1994. By generously financing faculty research efforts, the VCCS has invested in the knowledge and expertise of its professoriate, and this investment has, to date, yielded significant gains.

Of the 326 funded research proposals reviewed for the current study, the majority (57%) were submitted for the purpose of instructional development, i.e., to assist teaching faculty in developing more effective pedagogical philosophies, approaches, and techniques to better facilitate student learning. Grant projects identified in the instructional development category most often resulted in course and program design or revision. The majority of these projects involved the use of technology to enhance course content or to facilitate course delivery. For example, one project provided for an electronic exchange, enabling faculty and students at Tidewater Community College to actively exchange cultural, educational, and technological ideas with students at Baltic States Technical University in St. Petersburg, Russia. Another project involved utilization of CD-ROM technology to develop a self-paced, interactive learning module for workforce training. Another resulted in the development of interactive tutorial software to strengthen the spelling, reading, listening, and writing skills of learning disabled Spanish students. And telecourses were developed in nearly every discipline represented, including history, psychology, mathematics, science, English, business, and foreign language. From the actual set-up of a dial-in/Internet computerized communication center (virtual classroom) to the establishment of a computer laboratory for tutoring U. S. citizenship applicants to the development of a new degree program (Microcomputer Support Specialist), grant projects related to instructional development have resulted in clear and obvious curricular improvements.

It is easy to see that conducting research to determine the need for and to fund the development of new or enhanced curriculums is important for colleges and the students and communities they serve. Community colleges strive to respond quickly to changing

economic and social conditions that affect the education and training needs of their communities, so grant-supported course and program development is naturally beneficial—every stakeholder wins. Colleges offer an up-to-date curriculum that attracts students, students gain the knowledge and skills needed to be competitive, and communities maintain a well educated and well trained citizenry.

Many less obvious benefits have also been realized, however, through grant-funded research in the area of instructional development. The development of telecourses and network courses, for example, has brought about increased student access to education as well as cost savings for the institution. An Ultrasound Physics (DMS 205) course developed for network delivery by professors working at opposite ends of the state has resulted in the course being available to students at both colleges but requiring only one instructor (and salary) for delivery. Commonwealth (compressed video networked) classrooms—now operational at each campus—have enabled more and more shared courses like DMS 205 to be developed and delivered among the 23 colleges. And the development of typically low-enrolled courses, such as Calculus II and Law Enforcement Psychology, into telecourses that are readily available to those who cannot attend regularly scheduled classes, has generally resulted in increased access for students and increased enrollment for colleges.

Not all instructional development grant projects involved technology. Several projects involved the development of inter-disciplinary courses, such as a weight management course that integrated nutrition, exercise, and behavior modification. Some resulted in new course modules in everything from service learning to regional folklore. Some projects simply enabled faculty to experiment with new pedagogical techniques.

For example, an automotive technology instructor developed a comprehensive model for teaching complex automotive electronic fundamentals. And some projects involved classroom research, including a quantitative study of the impact of multi-media instruction on criminal justice learning. The instructional development projects reviewed for this study —both technology and non-technology based—effectively engaged faculty in serious, straightforward pedagogical and curriculum development that ultimately benefited students.

The aim of discipline development, which comprised 21 percent of funded proposals, is to build the knowledge and skills of faculty within their professional specialty or academic discipline. As would be expected, the projects identified as falling under this professional development category tended to be more strictly research based, i.e., they sought to discover new knowledge and tended to be replicable. The distinction between research and scholarship is an important one and should be noted here, for despite the name, the VCCS research grants are intended to support all scholarship, not only research in its strictest form. Scholarship is defined broadly to be the "umbrella under which research falls" and is intended to include any rational inquiry that involves critical analysis and "results in a product that is shared with others and that is subject to the criticism of individuals qualified to judge the product" (Vaughan, 1997, p. 10). So even though a number of funded grant projects involved empirical research—primarily those identified under discipline development—most projects had as their goal a product other than new knowledge intended for publication.

Three projects that represent the type and caliber of research grants funded for discipline development include (1) a long-term biogeochemical investigation to establish

baseline data to document and measure the decline of Eleutherodactylus and Bufo (frog) populations in Bermuda; (2) an archeological project that involved surface collection, remote sensing, and archival research conducted to locate and map prehistoric and historical sites of the Flourance tract of the original Chattertown Land Grant; and (3) a study of neotropical migrant birds that use Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge—the birds were captured, sexed, banded, and released to monitor avian populations. In keeping with the community college focus on student learning, students actively participated in each of these projects, giving them invaluable scientific field experience. The researchers reported additional student gains, such as cross-cultural training in the case of students who worked with the biologist in Bermuda, and employment opportunities both for students who assisted with monitoring the frog populations in Bermuda and for those who helped to monitor avian populations at the wildlife refuge. Researchers also reported less tangible gains such as the enthusiasm and excitement experienced by faculty researchers and students working and learning together. It was reported that several faculty and students continued the research even after the grant period ended.

Projects that were awarded continuation grants (multiple grants over time in support of a single project), as was the case with the discipline development grants discussed in the preceding paragraph, tended to be successful and to yield many positive outcomes, which suggests the importance of ongoing support for longitudinal projects. Another observation is that several successful VCCS grants were supplemented by other grants, such as Title III and National Science Foundation funds. In some cases, VCCS grant funds provided seed money for complex, long-term projects.

Projects emphasizing organizational development (21%) typically seek to integrate professional and institutional development; the purpose of these projects is to enhance administrative and leadership skills to bring about mutually beneficial outcomes for faculty and the college. Notable projects in the category of organizational development include the testing and norming of a general education assessment instrument (STAGE) that has now been adopted for use at six colleges, the inquiry into student performance in telecourses that led to measurable improvements in telecourse delivery, the study of student retention that resulted in a "soft entry" process for admitting at-risk students, and the establishment of a training program for English peer tutors. Several projects in categories other than organizational development initiated or expanded existing college programs in areas such as international education, workforce development, and distance education. Each of these projects addressed a college need, and each had as an outcome direct or indirect benefits for students.

Two organizational development projects that were especially innovative and far-reaching were an ArtReach project and a Text and Community project. The former joined art students with professional artists to bring art instruction to at-risk members of the community in a program that sought to raise self-esteem through self-expression. Working at a shelter for abused women and at a city alternative school, students and faculty together engaged in a team-teaching effort of sorts, which, in addition to benefiting community members, also gave participating art students invaluable lab and human service experience. The Text and Community project called "A Nation of Women," sought to create a shared reading experience for the student body, faculty and staff, and the local community, and to raise consciousness about minority issues and cultural pluralism—the

shared text was The Joy Luck Club. The actual outcomes of the project extended beyond intended outcomes. The project resulted in meaningful interaction among students and departments on campus; for example, one student produced a painting based on an interpretation of the book, and the painting was later purchased and placed on permanent display at the college. Photography students got involved in a photo contest that was part of the project, and even students from interior design, biology, math, English, and other classes participated. These two projects demonstrate the extent and magnitude of positive outcomes to students, faculty, colleges and communities that have resulted from VCCS research grants.

Only 1 percent of all funded research grants were identified as career development projects, that is, projects focused on providing faculty assistance with personal planning to improve the quality of work and life. Personal planning might be in the area of a new research interest, sabbatical leave, retirement, a career change, etc. One funded project enabled a faculty member, in his role as an Earthwatch volunteer, to be involved in the excavation and field preservation of Columbian and woolly mammoths in Hot Springs, South Dakota. He took slide photographs, kept a log to describe each slide, kept records of site findings and notes from scientists' lectures, and participated in field trips to additional sites in Nebraska. The faculty researcher reported that in addition to enhancing his knowledge and skills for career purposes, his students benefited from having a geology instructor who was freshly familiar with the excavation process and who possessed new and up-to-date course materials and slides. Similarly, an instructor who received a career development research grant to conduct on-site studies of Italian masterpieces reported not only working at her own art at a higher level but also seeing students benefit from a

teaching resource package she developed (slides, art references, technical lab notes, reference sketches, etc.) and from having an instructor fresh in the field of Italian art and its influences. Both of these faculty members cited rejuvenation as an important outcome of their projects, and both said their students benefited from this rejuvenation.

Nearly every grant recipient in every category—instructional, discipline, organizational, and career—cited professional rejuvenation as a benefit of having completed their research project. The notion that students benefit from having instructors who are professionally "reinvigorated," "renewed," "enthusiastic," or "fresh," to use the words of the faculty, is well established in this study. Although it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to establish through empirical research a direct and conclusive causal link between faculty rejuvenation and student learning, experiential data and common sense suggest that an instructor who brings excitement and enthusiasm to the classroom is going to inspire more learning than one who does not. Self-reports from faculty certainly support a connection between rejuvenation and student learning.

> The [research grant] experience was rejuvenating in a professional and personal sense. It helped me to get a fresh look at my work and myself. I have been able to apply the knowledge directly into the laboratory portion of courses I teach and will be able to do more in other courses I teach.
>
> * * *
>
> Everyone benefits by having a faculty member who has been refreshed and inspired by such a professional development opportunity.
>
> * * *

My research has generated a buzz of excitement . . . The benefits to my professional development and to my students exceeded my expectations.

Regardless of the development category assigned, and despite the almost limitless variety of projects undertaken, a commonly reported outcome of each was skills and knowledge enhancement for both faculty and students. Even grants intended to assist faculty in the development of areas other than instruction ultimately resulted in reported benefits to students.

Despite the plethora of well documented and, in many cases, well publicized achievements made possible by research grants, not all grant projects were successful. Several grant recipients were unable to complete their projects due to miscalculations about time to completion, insufficient preliminary research necessary for project implementation, inadequate technology and/or technical support, etc. Many of the technology-related problems have been resolved over the past two years as a result of dramatic improvements in the information infrastructure across the system, as well as specific guidelines and requirements set forth by the VCCS to ensure consistently high technological capability among the 23 colleges.

Other problems remain to be solved, particularly in three areas: participation in the research grant program, support for project conceptualization and completion, and production and dissemination of final reports. Relatively few faculty in the VCCS have submitted grant proposals, and applications are uneven across colleges, so an effort to encourage broad-based faculty application, particularly in targeted areas (topics or projects identified as directly relevant to systemwide problems or needs) is needed.

The study also revealed that several recipients lacked adequate information or support to complete their proposed projects, and, consequently, the projects were either aborted, or they were unsuccessful. Lack of information about multi-media copyright laws, lack of awareness of the time and money involved in multi-media production, and hardware and software incompatibility are a few of the problems commonly cited by recipients who did not successfully complete proposed projects involving technology. In many cases, these problems might have been averted through stronger, more direct support, particularly at the conceptualization stage of proposal development.

Finally, some recipients expressed frustration related to the production and dissemination of their final reports. It was suggested that better guidelines needed to be established for report writing. Some had no idea what happened to their final reports, questioning whether or not anyone actually read their written results. Several stated that if the reports were not to be used for timely dissemination of research findings, then perhaps the final reports were altogether unnecessary. Revised guidelines or directions for writing the final report might best be undertaken by previous grant recipients who submitted effective reports. As for dissemination of research findings, a structured plan is needed to achieve this important outcome.

Overall, this study revealed that the research grant component of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative has been successful in achieving its stated goal, to support and encourage research and scholarship among faculty. In fact, it has far surpassed that goal, as is evident from the many reported outcomes of faculty, student, college, and systemwide gains resulting from grant participation. These gains include, but are far from limited to, increased curriculum improvements, increased subject knowledge

and skills for instructors and students, collaboration among colleagues, improved student interest, as well as new materials for the classroom. Nonetheless, attention needs to be given to addressing identified weaknesses in grant procedures and processes that are either limiting grant participation or hindering successful grant completion.

Recommendations

Research findings suggest that conferences, workshops, seminars and other short-term, focused meetings are widely preferred by faculty for professional development; therefore, VCCS peer group conferences should be continued and expanded. The expansion need not involve additional monetary investment if existing computer networking and conferencing equipment is used to facilitate more frequent meetings. The addition of coordinated, electronically mediated discipline meetings should supplement, not supplant, face-to-face peer group conferences. Likewise, the regional Teaching Excellence Centers recently added as a component of the Initiative can supplement peer group meetings by sponsoring regional conferences. All sponsored conferences or professional meetings, whether statewide peer group conferences, electronically mediated meetings, or regional meetings should be sensitive to the time constraints of faculty. And all should invite and encourage the participation of all full-time and part-time faculty. Further, faculty should receive notice of planned meetings at least one semester in advance in order to accommodate their teaching schedules.

In terms of meeting content, research findings suggest an increased need for technology training in every discipline, but findings further suggest that training needs are being adequately addressed through the annual New Horizons conference (focus is on

technology), college-sponsored technology training programs, peer group conferences, and other funded meetings and workshops. In general, planning groups for conferences and meetings are largely comprised of faculty representatives from the different VCCS colleges; therefore, meeting content is determined by faculty preferences and needs. It is recommended that faculty representing the varying circumstances and needs (including needs specific to faculty career stage) of VCCS colleges continue to serve on planning committees, thereby playing a key role in determining meeting content. Undoubtedly, technology-related issues and skills will continue, for the foreseeable future, to be priority agenda items for general and discipline-specific meetings.

As was discussed in the previous section, findings suggest that greater encouragement and support for research grant participation is needed, as is a more effective means for disseminating and recognizing outstanding projects. In fact, better dissemination of information, ideas, and outcomes of each professional development program would, it is believed, serve to keep all constituents better apprised of program activities. And a comprehensive marketing strategy to internally promote each of the various VCCS professional development programs would serve to increase faculty awareness, interest and participation. It is therefore recommended that the VCCS professional development staff work to identify and implement specific strategies for addressing these needs.

The research techniques applied in this study were appropriate for achieving the objective, which was to evaluate the actual effects of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative. By utilizing quantitative (survey) and qualitative (focus groups, textual coding and analysis) methods, research findings were triangulated, yielding more valid and reliable

results. It is believed that these results could be further tested and supported through case study research, which should occur longitudinally across program components. Future studies should also apply focus group research to other program components, for this method proved extremely valuable to better understanding the multifarious effects of the peer group conference component of the Initiative. Quantitative research alone is simply insufficient to adequately capture the many effects of a complex professional development program like the VCCS Initiative. Finally, all future research studies, which should occur regularly for the ongoing improvement or cost/benefit assessment of each program component, must be carefully designed and implemented to measure learning gains for faculty and students brought about by the VCCS Professional Development Initiative.

Conclusion

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate the actual effects of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative and to determine the extent to which these effects have addressed the documented professional development needs of faculty and the extent to which these effects resulted in enhanced student learning. This objective was accomplished. Results of the five-year follow-up survey and the qualitative research techniques applied to peer group conferences and research grants revealed that the professional development needs of faculty are largely being addressed through the VCCS Professional Development Initiative, and student learning has been enhanced. More faculty are now attending conferences or professional meetings—their professional activity of choice—than in 1992 as a result of increased funding for this development activity, particularly through peer group conferences and other VCCS sponsored workshops and

meetings. Peer group conferences have effectively addressed the problem of professional isolation, having brought faculty from every discipline together to address significant professional issues and to learn from each other. Research grants have supported and encouraged faculty scholarship in every major area of development. And both peer group conferences and research grants have provided faculty with sundry opportunities to keep abreast of the rapid technological changes affecting teaching and learning in every discipline and every academic program. Most importantly, research findings indicate that the VCCS Professional Development Initiative has succeeded remarkably well in enhancing student learning, which is its overarching goal. In the words of Chancellor Arnold R. Oliver who conceived and implemented the Initiative:

> The goal of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative must be to enhance student learning, since that is what our enterprise is about. In order to achieve significant advancement in student learning, I believe that the heart and soul of our System—our faculty and staff—must have opportunities to grow and expand our vision of what we are and what we can become.

Through visionary leadership and significant investment at the system level, active support at the college level, and strong professional commitment at the faculty level, Virginia's community colleges and the students they serve have derived abundant and manifold benefits—both tangible and intangible, measurable and immeasurable—from the VCCS Professional Development Initiative.

Works Cited

Black, B. (1997). Peer group/discipline meetings: A VCCS phenomenon. Inquiry: The Journal of The Virginia Community Colleges, 1 (1), 80-82.

Block, J. (1991). False dichotomies. In G. B. Vaughan & J. C. Palmer (Eds.), Enhancing teaching and administration through scholarship. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Burnstad, H. M. (1994). Management of human resources in the community college. In Baker, G. A. (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 386-395). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hall, D. T. (1976). Careers in Organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Harnish, D., & Wild, L. A. (1992). In the words of the faculty: What difference does professional development make? Community College Review, 20 (2), 20-29.

Maxwell, W. E., & Kazlauskas, E. J. (1992). Which faculty development methods really work in community colleges? A review of research. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 16, 351-360.

Mott, M. C. (1994). REFRAME: A model for promoting faculty vitality and excellence. Journal of Staff, Program, and Organizational Development, 11 (3), 151-160.

O'Banion, T. (1997). A learning college for the 21st century. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Palmer, J. C. & Vaughan, G. B. (Eds.). (1992). Fostering a climate for faculty scholarship at community colleges. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Palmer, J. C. (1991). Nurturing scholarship at community colleges. In G. B. Vaughan & J. C. Palmer (Eds.), Enhancing teaching and administration through scholarship (pp. 69-77). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schwandt, L. (1996). An investigation of the organizational factors that foster academic vitality, commitment, and innovation among two-year occupational faculty. Paper presented at the Fifth Annual International Conference for Community and Technical College Chairs, Deans, and Other Organizational Leaders in Phoenix/Mesa, AZ, February 14-17).

Seidman, E. (1985). In the words of the faculty. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Sydow, D. L. (1993). A plan for revitalization: Maximizing professional development Opportunity. Report prepared for the Virginia Community College System in April, 1993.

Vaughan, G. B. (1991). Scholarship and the community college professional: Focusing the debate. In G. B. Vaughan & J. C. Palmer (Eds.), Enhancing teaching and administration through scholarship (pp. 3-15). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Vaughan, G. B. (1997). Why scholarship? Inquiry: The Journal of The Virginia Community Colleges, 1 (1), 8-13.

APPENDIX 1

Peer Group Conference
Evaluation Summary

1. What were three highlights of the conference/meeting?

2. Were you disappointed in any area of the conference/meeting? If yes, which area and why?

3. How do you think this peer group meeting will effect your institution, discipline or specialty?

4. What three areas would you like included at the next meeting/conference?

5. Did this conference stimulate any ideas, changes, or improvements that you would like to implement upon return to your campus? If so, please describe your formative thoughts.

Please rate the following: (with 5 being the highest and 1 being the lowest)

6. The overall conference

7. The workshops

8. The keynote presentations

9. The interactions among colleagues

10. The usefulness of conference for update and innovation

11. The opportunity of personal renewal

12. The potential to enhance professional effectiveness

13. The conference facilities/hotel staff

14. The conference location

15. The meals adequately prepared/selected

16. The most appropriate description of your position

APPENDIX 2

Moderator's Guide

1st Greet: "Good Morning/Afternoon"

2nd Introduction: "Welcome everyone. My name is _____; please feel free to call me by my first name."

3rd Purpose: "The purpose of today's focus group discussion is to give you the opportunity to share your thoughts regarding peer group conferences you have attended in your discipline. This activity is part of a comprehensive, five-year evaluation of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative that the chancellor has commissioned. Your responses are vital to us because they will help us to ensure that future peer group meetings offer meaningful programs that are responsive to your needs."

4th Procedure: "For our discussion today, we have (#) participating. Since this discussion is being tape recorded for later transcription and analysis, I will need each participant to give your first name each time you answer."

5th Begin: "I would like to begin by asking you . . .

1. In your opinion, what are some of the reasons for having peer group meetings as a component of the VCCS Professional Development Initiative?

2. I want you to think of a peer group session that you liked because you had gained new knowledge or acquired a new technique to apply in the classroom. I would like for you to tell me what that knowledge or technique was and how you applied it in your teaching.

3. Now, I want you to think of a speaker that you liked. What about the speaker or the speech did you like?

4. So far, we have discussed many benefits you feel you have received from the Peer Group programs. Now I would like for you to share with me some of your ideas about ways we can expand VCCS professional development activities. In particular, what are some of the things we can do to ensure that the peer group meetings have a greater reach, impact and use?

5. (Responses are summarized and participants are asked for further comments.) Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study."

APPENDIX 3

VCCS FACULTY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH GRANTS

*** *Part I* ***

The Program

Faculty professional development is an essential requisite for faculty and student learning. To support faculty in this enterprise, awards for new and on-going professional development and research will be available to all full-time community college faculty in Virginia. Opportunities for research will include the following areas:

Discipline development - builds knowledge and skills within the academic discipline or professional specialty.

Instructional development - improves classroom teaching, learning, and assessment techniques.

Career development - provides tools for effective personal planning to improve the quality of work and life.

Organizational development - enhances administrative and leadership skills to fulfill the institutional mission of the community college.

A combination of reassigned time and grant award is possible dependent upon the quality, objectives, extent, and benefit of the proposed faculty research and professional development activity. Approximately 56% of the grant proposals received are funded.

Funding Available for 1996-97

Reassigned Time	Will Support Approximately	Total Allocation
$500 per credit up to 6 credit hours)	120 credit hours of reassigned time	$ 60,000
$ 2,250 for summer stipend *(Taxes & social security will be deducted from summer stipend.)*	12	$ 27,000

Reimbursement Awards	Will Support Approximately	Total Allocation
Monetary awards to support the objectives of your research (see proposal instructions #4 and #10).	60-80	$ 113,000

Grant awards for reassigned time will be transferred to the college for adjunct replacement through the normal budget process. Faculty will receive the grant award in the form of reimbursement only through a college budget account established to fulfill the objectives of the research.

The Procedure

Proposal for faculty grants address the following areas:

1. Purpose of research activity
2. Methodology
3. Benefit to you, students, discipline, college, VCCS, and the community
4. Collaboration with students, faculty, other colleges, business/industry or community organizations
5. Budget outline
6. Evaluation of project
7. Dissemination. Special consideration will be given to faculty who present the results of their research at national conferences

Proposals will be reviewed and ranked for scholarship, feasibility, and contributions to you, students, the discipline, the college, VCCS, and your community. Grants will be considered through a peer review process established by the VCCS Professional Development Committee, which is representative of faculty throughout Virginia and appointed by the Chancellor. **Your name and college will appear only (do not include reference to either in the proposal) on the cover of the proposal to ensure anonymous review. Any applications received with identification of the applicant's name or college in the proposal will not be reviewed but will be returned with directions to remove identification.** Faculty will coordinate reassigned time and grant specifics with their division chair/supervisor and dean.

Questions regarding the process can be addressed to Dr. Bernadette Black at 804/225-2290 or by electronic mail to SOBLACB @ VCCSCENT.BITNET or Fax 804/786-3787.

Deadlines

Deadlines will be the same every year. If due dates fall on a weekend, then the following Monday will serve as the due date.

Research Award Schedule

Application Deadlines*	Notification Dates	Effective Date**	Final Report & Reimbursement Deadlines***
February 15	March 30	Summer semester	November 15
April 15	May 30	Fall semester	March 15
September 15	October 30	Spring semester	August 15

Faculty Proposals need to be **received** by 5:00 p.m. on deadline date. No exceptions.

Faculty will coordinate reassigned time with their division chair and dean. One proposal per faculty member will be considered in a review cycle.

Evaluation of results and documentation of expenditures will be required by the deadline date.

Additional proposal packets are available through college deans and provosts.

*** *Part II* ***

VCCS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH INSTRUCTIONS

Cover Page Instructions

Title. Succinctly describe your grant project.

Primary Author. Identify the one full-time faculty member, inclusive of administrators, librarians, counselors, and teaching faculty who will serve as the point of contact for correspondence and be responsible for the grant objectives, the budget, and the final report. This is the only person who will receive notification about grant specifics. **This is the only place where your name and college should appear to ensure the anonymous peer-review process. Any applications received with identification of the applicant's name or college in the proposal will not be reviewed but will be returned with directions to remove identification.** Please indicate your full title with either Dr., Mr., or Ms.

Faculty Co-applicants. If other individuals are to collaborate on your research grant, please provide their name(s) and feel free to add additional names on a separate sheet if more space is needed. This is the only place where their names and colleges should appear. Adjunct faculty and classified staff may serve as co-applicants but cannot at this time be designated as primary authors.

Faculty Signature(s) and Dates. Read the agreement, sign and date your proposal.

Signatures of College Administrators. Before endorsement, your college administrators need to review the budget section of your research grant proposal to consider the estimated college contribution. Signatures are required from your division or unit supervisor, provost or dean, and your college president. Their signatures will indicate their support of your research proposal.

Proposal Instructions

The following information forms the body of your proposal and will be submitted to the Research Grant Subcommittee for anonymous peer review.

1. Title of Proposal. Repeat same title from the cover page of your proposal.

2. Abstract. Write a brief abstract or summary of your proposal in 50 words or less. Highlight the purpose of your grant activities and its potential benefits.

3. a) Have you received a VCCS research grant before? Answer yes or no.
(If yes, specify semester and year in which you received a VCCS research grant. Also, any overdue final reports must be submitted before a subsequent grant award can be made.)

   b) Some faculty have research projects that extend into the next semester. Answer "yes" if this proposal builds on your last VCCS research grant award and "no" if it is a new proposal. **Continuation Proposals must include a status report to enable reviewers to evaluate proposals and continuation of funds. The proposal will be rejected without this item.**

   c) If you have another source of grant funding either from inside or outside the college, please indicate so here. If "yes" be specific in your budget section about how this grant award will supplement and enhance existing grant funding.

4. Proposal Request.
   a) Reassigned Time: **Select only one of these items.**

      (I) **For Fall/Spring submission:** Indicate the number of semester hours for reassigned time that you are requesting. State the total amount in the space provided by multiplying the requested hours by $500. This amount will be sent to your college to reimburse an adjunct faculty member.

      (II) **For Summer submission:** A stipend will only be awarded in this session since reassigned time is not possible. The stipend amount of $2250 will be awarded minus taxes and social security.

   b) **Grant Award:** If you are requesting a monitory grant, use a check mark to indicate the appropriate category of low, medium, or high award. Monitory awards can be used to fulfill the objectives of your research. The amount requested should exactly match the amount listed under the budget section of the proposal. Do not include the amount indicated in 4a.

   c) In the blank provided, indicate the total amount of your proposal request. The total proposal request is obtained by totaling the dollar amount of reassigned time and the dollar amount of the monitory grant award.

5. Proposal Submission. Use a check mark to indicate the semester for which your grant application is being made. In the blank next to the semester, enter the appropriate year. Use a check mark to indicate the type of grant for which application is being made. See VCCS Professional Development Initiative materials for definitions of discipline, instructional, organizational, and career development. Each faculty member will be allowed one proposal per review cycle. If a faculty member submits more than one proposal in a single review cycle, the faculty member will be notified and asked to select one proposal.

6. Purpose. Briefly state the purpose of the research activity or project. You may use the proposal form or re-type providing the same information in the same format in the same space provided.

7. Methodology. Describe your research plan, i.e., the steps that you will use to accomplish your research project. Be certain that your methodology justifies your proposed budget. (See item #10)

8. Benefits of Proposal. Explain the anticipated benefits of your research objectives. This section may directly refer to your individual development plan. Will the grant help you to fulfill your personal and professional goals? How will your students, your discipline, and/or your college benefit from your grant? Are there any other potential benefits for the community and/or VCCS? Be specific and brief.

9. Collaboration. If applicable, describe the collaborative aspects of your project, i.e., interaction and/or communication with groups inside and/or outside the college. Be specific and brief.

10. Budget Section. *If you are requesting only reassigned time, DO NOT complete this section.* **Reimbursable expenses will not include college tuition, personnel costs, most computer hardware, some computer software, and direct cost associated with book publication.**

a) Budget Outline: Provide a cost outline that clearly supports the methodology section of your proposal. (See item #7) Grant money will be provided for reimbursable expenses only. Be specific about the dollar amount of each item requested and provide information as to how you derived at the estimated cost, e.g. vendor quotes, business office estimates, catalog research, etc.

b) College Contribution: Provide an itemized estimate of the college contribution only after your division or unit has reviewed and approved these expenditures.

c) Personal Contribution: Provide an estimate of your personal contribution to the proposal which may include expenses already incurred that directly relate to the proposed project or expenses that you are willing to incur to accomplish your research objectives.

11. Evaluation of Proposal. Indicate how you intend to assess the outcome of your research project. What method of evaluation will you use to determine if the objectives of your research project have been achieved? How will you know that you have fulfilled the objectives of your research?

12. Dissemination of Results. Indicate how you will share your results within classes, division/unit, college, VCCS, and/or national organizations. You are strongly encouraged to share the results of your research with your students and/or with your colleagues at peer group meetings, at local conferences, and at national professional association meetings. Dissemination of results may require a future research grant proposal. **Materials developed or created while employed by the Commonwealth of Virginia are subject to Section 12, *Intellectual Property*, of the *VCCS Manual*. Any materials developed or created in full or in part through VCCS Research Grant Awards should acknowledge the contribution of the college and the VCCS.** ***(Refer to Section 12, VCCS Policy Manual).***

*** *Part III* ***

PROPOSAL FORM
FOR VCCS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH AWARD
(See Cover Page Instructions)

Title of Proposal: _____

_____

Primary Author:
Name: _____

Title: _____

Department: _____
College: _____ Campus: _____
Telephone #: _____ work _____ home

Faculty/Staff Co-Applicants:

Name: _____
Title: _____
Department: _____
College: _____ Campus: _____
Telephone #: _____ work _____ home

Name: _____
Title: _____
Department: _____
College: _____ Campus: _____
Telephone #: _____ work _____ home

(Add Additional Pages if Necessary)

Agreement:
I am a full-time faculty member in the VCCS. I agree to fulfill the objectives of my proposal for professional development research. I will provide the results of my project as a final report on or before the deadline date. I will coordinate reassigned time and award specifics with my division chair/supervisor and dean.

_____ _____
Faculty Signature Date

Please review budget section for anticipated college contribution, if appropriate.
College endorsement of faculty professional development research proposal.

_____ _____
Division Chair/Supervisor Date

_____ _____
Provost/Dean Date

_____ _____
President Date

***** Please note: List your name and college on this application sheet only *****

VCCS Proposal/Cover Page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Number _____
Reviewer _____

Proposal for VCCS Professional Development Research Grant

(Please do not include your name or college on this proposal to ensure anonymous review. Any applications received with identification of the applicant's name or college in the proposal will not be reviewed but will be returned with directions to remove identification.)

(You may use this form or re-type providing the same information in the same format in the same space.)

1) **Title of Proposal:** _____

_____

2) **Abstract of Proposal (50 words or less):**

3a) **Have you received a VCCS research grant before?** _____ Yes _____ No
If so, specify semester and year. _____
(Also, any overdue final reports must be submitted before a subsequent grant award can be made.)

3b) **Is this proposal continuing a previously awarded VCCS grant?** _____ Yes _____ No
(Continuation Proposals must include a status report to enable reviewers to evaluate proposals and continuation of funds.)

3c) **Is the proposal designed to supplement another type of grant?** _____ Yes _____ No
If so, specify type of grant and funding total. _____

_____

4) **This proposal is a request for:**
(May be a combination of reassigned time and grant award)

a) Reassigned Time:
_____ Number of credits ($500 per credit hour up to 6 credit hours for adjunct faculty replacement) Total $ amount _____
_____ $ 2,250 as stipend for summer semester (will be awarded minus taxes and social security).

b) Grant Award: (Only to be used for reimbursable expenses. Provide a budget summary on page 4).
_____ low award ($100 - $1,500) for $ _____
_____ medium award ($1,501 - $3,000) for $ _____
_____ high award ($3,001 - $5,000) for $ _____

c) _____ Total Proposal request (Add 4a + 4b).

5) Proposal submitted for:	Type of Grant	
1. ___ Summer Semester - February 15, ___		
2. ___ Fall Semester - April 15, ___	___ Discipline	___ Organizational
3. ___ Spring Semester - September 15, ___	___ Instructional	___ Career

VCCS Proposal/Cover Page

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*** *Part IV* ***

VCCS Professional Development Research Award Proposal

Please do not include your name, college or any other identifying reference on this proposal to ensure anonymous review. Any applications received with identification of the applicant's name or college in the proposal will not be reviewed but will be returned with directions to remove identification.

(You may use this form or re-type providing the same information in the same format in the same space.)

6) **Purpose of research activity**

7) **Methodology**

8) **Benefit of this proposal to you (how does it fit into your individual development plan), students, discipline, college, community and/or VCCS?**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9) **Collaboration with students, faculty, other colleges, business/industry, or community organizations (include all that apply):**

10a) **Budget outline:**

Budget Requests	How Cost Derived?	Estimated Amount

Total Reimbursement Request $ _____

10b) **College contribution:**

10c) **Personal contribution:**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

11. **Evaluation of proposal:**

12. a) **Dissemination of results of your research:**

b) **I am willing to present the findings of my research grant at (check all that applies):**

___ **Peer group conference** ___ **New Horizons Conference** ___ **VCCA Conference**

___ **Other (specify)** _____

*** * * The decision of the committee is final * * ***

Send seven stapled copies (including one original) of the proposal packet without binders, folders, or covers of any kind by the deadline date at 5:00 p.m. to:

Professional Development Research Award Subcommittee
Academic Services & Research
Virginia Community College System
101 North 14th Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Refer to research award program schedule for application deadlines.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

* * * *Part V* * * *

VCCS Professional Development
Research Grants

Final Report Outline

Please summarize the results of your grant project using the following outline as a guide. This report will be shared with colleagues throughout the VCCS. If more space is needed, use additional sheet(s) Do not exceed three typed pages. If a written product resulted from your grant, please enclose. You may submit hard copy and/or diskette (specify the software used).

1) Name:_____ (Circle: Dr. Mrs. Mrs.)

Title:_____

College:_____

Telephone (Work#):_____

Fax #:_____

Email:_____ Date of Funding:_____

2) Title of Grant:_____

3) Abstract (50 words or less)

4) Expected results/outcomes

5) Actual results/outcomes

6) Critique of research project. What would you repeat or change?

7) Budget expenditures

8) What benefits were you able to provide for your students, discipline, college, community and or VCCS?

9) How have you disseminated the results or outcome of your project? Include future plans as well.

Send seven stapled copies (including one original) without binders, folders, or covers of any kind by the specified deadline date at 5:00 p.m. to:

Professional Development Research Award Subcommittee
Academic Services & Research
Virginia Community College System
101 North 14th Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219

	Effective Date	
Summer Grants	**due**	**November 15**
Fall Grants	**due**	**March 15**
Spring Grants	**due**	**August 15**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 4

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SURVEY OF VCCS FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION

Instructions: Please use the attached answer sheet for all responses. The answer sheet will be mechanically scanned, so use a soft lead (#2) pencil to fill in the appropriate circles. Completely erase any answers you decide to change.

The questionnaire is divided into five sections. Questions in the first three sections ask for information related to your own professional development experiences, including current activities, individual goals, and institutional support. Questions in the fourth section ask for information about your participation in VCCS Professional Development activities. Questions in the fifth section ask for demographic information. Please respond as accurately as possible to each question.

I. CURRENT PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

During a typical semester, what is the average number of hours you spend per week on each of the following activities? **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) 0 hours (b) 1-5 hours (c) 6-10 hours (d) 11-20 hours (e) over 20 hours

1. performing principal duties of position held (e.g., teaching, counseling, administrating, etc.)
2. performing activities related to teaching (e.g., planning, evaluating students' work, etc.)
3. advising, counseling, and/or otherwise interacting with students (outside of class)
4. interacting with colleagues informally (i.e., outside of staff & committee meetings, etc.)
5. doing committee work
6. seeking outside funding (e.g., grant writing)
7. conducting research
8. attending or preparing for professional meetings or conferences
9. giving performances or exhibitions in the fine or applied arts
10. recruiting
11. taking courses or doing work toward an advanced degree
12. giving speeches
13. doing community service work
14. attending workshops, classes, etc., solely to improve professional performance
15. outside paid employment (e.g., consulting, freelance work, self-owned business)
16. doing work related to a professional organization
17. reading professional journals
18. teaching overload (credit hours)
19. interacting with outside agencies (e.g., business, industry, schools, etc.)
20. other (please specify on answer sheet)

Indicate the number of years it has been since you participated in the following activities. **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) 3 years or fewer (b) 4-6 years (c) 7-9 years (d) 10 years or more (e) not applicable

21. attended a professional conference or workshop in my field
22. taken educational leave or a sabbatical
23. engaged in research or other scholarly work that led to a publication, an exhibit, or other professionally recognized contribution in my field
24. participated in an internship or exchange program (business or educational)
25. developed a new course
26. significantly revised a course on the basis of new developments in my field
27. significantly revised a course on the basis of new developments in technology
28. significantly revised a course to incorporate elements of general education
29. completed a university credit course
30. participated in an innovative teaching experiment (e.g., team teaching, writing across the curriculum, computer-assisted instruction, etc.)
31. had an article published in a journal in my field
32. authored, co-authored, edited, or contributed one or more chapters to a published book in my field
33. applied to an outside agency for a research grant to study a problem in my field
34. participated in the planning, organization, and/or offering of a workshop, conference, etc.
35. participated in a scheduled colloquy to discuss a professional issue
36. served on a professional committee outside the college

II. INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT GOALS

37. *Will you pursue professional development in the upcoming year?*

    a. yes
    b. no

Indicate the importance to you of the following professional goals. **(Respond by using one of the options given below. If not applicable, leave blank.)**

(a) unimportant (b) somewhat unimportant (c) somewhat important (d) important (e) not a goal

38. become more effective at my job (e.g., teaching, counseling, etc.)
39. become more knowledgeable in my field
40. obtain a higher degree
41. obtain a higher rank
42. obtain an administrative position (if you currently hold a faculty or other position)
43. obtain a position at a four-year college or university
44. obtain a position in a non-academic setting
45. obtain a full-time teaching position (if you currently hold a part-time position)
46. other (please specify on answer sheet)

How likely is it that you will actually pursue each of the following if given the opportunity, e.g., through funding, sabbatical or educational leave, released time, etc.? **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) unlikely (b) somewhat unlikely (c) somewhat likely (d) likely (e) does not apply

47. university credit courses
48. non-credit courses
49. professional conferences
50. college-sponsored presentations, workshops, seminars, etc.
51. internship or exchange in business/industry
52. academic exchange (i.e., work at another institution for a specified time)
53. research and scholarship
54. formal colloquies or symposia with colleagues
55. summer institutes, workshops, etc.
56. other (please specify on answer sheet)

57. ***When you decide <u>not</u> to participate in a professional development activity that is available to you, which of the following tends to be the <u>single greatest factor</u> influencing that decision?***

    a. lack of interest
    b. inconvenient due to personal circumstances (e.g., child care, physical health, etc.)
    c. lack of money
    d. lack of time
    e. other (please specify on answer sheet)

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field and/or improving your professional performance. **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) ineffective (b) somewhat ineffective (c) somewhat effective (d) effective (e) have not pursued

58. university credit courses
59. non-credit courses
60. professional conferences
61. on-campus presentations, workshops, seminars, etc.
62. internships or exchanges in industry/education (working in field)
63. research and scholarship
64. site visits
65. formal colloquia or symposia with colleagues
66. informal conversations with colleagues
67. professional journals
68. professional committee or task force work
69. teleconferences
70. computer networks
71. other (please specify on answer sheet)

III. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

72. ***How would you describe the overall attitude of the administration at your institution toward professional development?***

a. strongly encourages professional development
b. mildly encourages professional development
c. neither encourages or discourages professional development (neutral)
d. mildly discourages professional development
e. strongly discourages professional development

In your opinion, how adequate is your institution's financial support for the following. **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) inadequate (b) somewhat inadequate (c) somewhat adequate (d) adequate (e) does not apply

73. tuition reimbursement
74. sabbaticals
75. educational leave
76. released time
77. flexible scheduling to accommodate individual professional development activities
78. professional association memberships (fees)
79. registration fees for professional meetings (e.g., conferences, committees, etc.)
80. travel expenses for professional meetings (e.g., conferences, committee, etc.)
81. retraining for fields significantly affected by rapidly changing technology
82. training in computer skills

Assuming, as the literature suggests, that institutional environment and professional development are interrelated, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) strongly disagree (b) mildly disagree (c) mildly agree (d) strongly agree (e) neutral

83. morale in this institution is generally high
84. there is a sense of community at this institution
85. professionals here respect each other
86. there is a sense of collegiality at this institution
87. efforts to try new approaches to meet job demands are generally supported here
88. faculty and administration here are typically at odds
89. an intellectual environment exists here
90. sufficient opportunities for professional development are made available here
91. professionals here are appreciated by supervisors for doing their jobs well

IV. VCCS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

When, if applicable, did you participate in the following professional development programs or activities? **(Respond by marking all options that apply. If you have not participated in the activity, leave blank.)**

(a) 1993 (b) 1994 (c) 1995 (d) 1996 (e) 1997

92. VCCS Research Grant award recipient
93. Peer Group Conference(s) in my discipline
94. Teleconference on campus or in region
95. Instructional or Administrative Leaders Seminar
96. New Horizons Conference
97. VCCS Technology Skills Certification Program
98. Individual Development Plan (either system or college version)

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field and/or improving your professional performance. **(Respond by using one of the options given below.)**

(a) ineffective (b) somewhat ineffective (c) somewhat effective (d) effective (e) have not pursued

99. VCCS Research Grant award recipient
100. Peer Group Conference(s) in my discipline
101. Teleconference on campus or in region
102. Instructional or Administrative Leaders Seminar
103. New Horizons Conference
104. VCCS Technology Skills Certification Program
105. Individual Development Plan (either system or college version)

What long-term, direct or indirect benefits were realized as a result of your involvement in each of the following VCCS professional development programs or activities. **(Respond by marking all options that apply. If you have not participated in the activity, leave blank.)**

(a) improved classroom instruction (b) professional reinvigoration/renewal
(c) enhanced student learning (d) no benefit (e) other (please specify on answer sheet)

106. VCCS Research Grant award recipient
107. Peer Group Conference(s) in my discipline
108. Teleconference on campus or in region
109. Instructional or Administrative Leaders Seminar
110. New Horizons Conference
111. VCCS Technology Skills Certification Program
112. Individual Development Plan (either system or college version)

113. ***In general, do you believe the VCCS Professional Development Initiative has been successful in providing greater support for professional development throughout the twenty-three colleges in the Virginia Community College System?***

Yes_____ No_____ Comments (please respond on answer sheet):

V. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

114. ***Position currently held?***
- a. administrator
- b. teaching faculty
- c. counselor
- d. librarian
- e. other

115. ***Number of years in current position?***
- a. 0 years
- b. 1-5 years
- c. 6-10 years
- d. 11-20 years
- e. over 20 years

116. ***Number of years at your college?***
- a. 0 years
- b. 1-5 years
- c. 6-10 years
- d. 11-20 years
- e. 0ver 20 years

117. ***Present academic rank?*** **(If not applicable, or if your rank is not listed, leave blank.)**
- a. professor
- b. associate professor
- c. assistant professor
- d. instructor
- e. lecturer/adjunct faculty

118. ***Administrative title?***
- a. not applicable
- b. dean
- c. division chair or director
- d. coordinator or administrator of a center, lab, or program
- e. other

119. ***Age?***
- a. under 30
- b. 30-39
- c. 40-49
- d. 50-59
- e. 60 and over

120. ***Sex?***
- a. female
- b. male

121. ***Highest degree currently held?***
   a. doctoral degree
   b. master's + 24, Specialist, C.A.G.S.
   c. master's degree
   d. professional degree beyond bachelor's
   e. bachelor's degree

122. ***Degree currently working toward?*** **(If not applicable, leave blank.)**
   a. doctoral degree
   b. master's + 24, specialist, C.A.G.S.
   c. master's degree
   d. professional degree beyond bachelor's
   e. bachelor's degree

123. ***Type of courses most frequently taught?***
   a. transfer courses
   b. occupational/technical courses
   c. does not apply

Standard prefix of courses most frequently taught? (please respond on answer sheet)

Major or area of specialization of highest degree held? (please respond on answer sheet)

Division, department, or program in which you work? (please respond on answer sheet)

Thank you for taking time to complete this questionnaire. Please place the form and answer sheet in an envelope provided, seal, and return to the appropriate office at your college.

Appendix 5
Comparison of VCCS and College Data (raw numbers)

The following are numbers of responses from each college to assist with reading the following table:

	Requested	Returned
Blue Ridge	70	62
Central Virginia	80	72
Dabney S. Lancaster	40	36
Danville	70	69
Eastern Shore	30	28
Germanna	65	51
J. Sargeant Reynolds	191	154
John Tyler	97	49
Lord Fairfax	65	62
Mountain Empire	80	69
New River	80	76
Northern Virginia	674	519
Patrick Henry	62	61
Paul D. Camp	40	32
Piedmont Virginia	80	63
Rappahannock	54	43
Southside	74	66
Southwest	96	86
Thomas Nelson	110	55
Tidewater	332	238
Virginia Highlands	75	62
Virginia Western	130	104
Wytheville	75	70
VCCS	18	10
TOTAL	2,688	2,137

During a typical semester, what is the average number of hours you spend per week on each of the following activities?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Performing principal duties of position held																									
0 hours	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1-5 hours	14	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	1	0
6-10 hours	42	1	2	1	2	0	3	2	0	3	3	0	14	1	2	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1
11-20 hours	556	20	16	18	2	3	19	35	17	14	17	21	149	8	14	15	11	12	17	79	16	0	13	22	18
over 20 hours	1481	39	52	48	30	24	29	106	29	45	49	53	334	23	45	47	29	51	67	154	39	10	47	81	50
Performing activities related to teaching																									
0 hours	185	7	7	8	3	3	2	11	2	3	5	10	35	5	6	6	5	6	6	12	4	8	10	12	9
1-5 hours	331	8	10	8	7	7	6	18	8	13	13	9	87	4	12	9	9	13	15	31	6	2	6	19	11
6-10 hours	504	18	13	12	3	6	14	32	11	19	19	15	130	8	14	16	11	14	26	51	9	0	19	32	12
11-20 hours	656	18	22	28	8	8	19	48	13	14	21	30	149	10	15	21	8	13	29	99	20	0	18	21	24
over 20 hours	410	9	17	11	13	3	10	35	13	13	11	10	101	5	14	9	10	18	10	43	16	0	7	19	13
Advising ... interacting with students																									
0 hours	105	6	4	2	1	0	1	12	2	1	1	1	27	2	1	3	2	4	4	6	3	9	2	6	5
1-5 hours	1086	38	40	40	14	16	27	64	26	36	35	39	278	18	32	31	18	29	40	114	25	0	35	56	35
6-10 hours	589	12	19	20	10	5	16	42	14	16	22	22	133	4	18	18	12	17	25	83	17	0	17	27	20
11-20 hours	207	4	4	4	7	4	7	20	4	6	11	8	37	5	7	6	5	11	11	23	5	1	3	8	6
over 20 hours	98	0	3	2	1	2	0	5	0	3	0	4	28	2	3	3	6	3	5	11	5	0	3	6	3
Interacting with colleagues informally																									
0 hours	90	2	1	2	2	0	0	7	1	0	4	2	22	0	2	3	2	2	6	17	2	0	5	5	3
1-5 hours	1700	52	61	54	26	24	46	115	43	52	56	59	396	26	51	55	32	53	70	187	45	7	45	88	57
6-10 hours	229	5	7	8	5	1	3	16	2	7	3	8	68	5	6	2	5	5	9	28	7	3	9	9	8
11-20 hours	52	1	1	1	0	2	2	5	1	2	3	3	11	1	2	1	3	4	0	3	0	0	2	1	0
over 20 hours	16	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	1

During a typical semester, what is the average number of hours you spend per week on each of the following activities?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Doing committee work																									
0 hours	249	10	3	7	5	1	2	18	4	2	4	8	62	1	3	1	0	10	14	63	0	0	3	24	4
1-5 hours	1654	38	62	56	26	25	45	110	38	55	53	60	397	27	53	53	35	48	66	164	48	7	55	72	61
6-10 hours	147	10	3	3	1	1	3	13	4	3	12	4	34	4	3	7	4	6	4	8	5	3	2	5	5
11-20 hours	27	2	3	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	8	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0
over 20 hours	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Seeking outside funding																									
0 hours	1549	48	59	54	24	20	36	98	38	40	54	57	360	22	44	47	32	45	59	189	35	7	45	87	49
1-5 hours	477	12	9	13	9	6	13	44	8	18	9	13	125	10	14	13	10	19	23	44	15	2	14	16	18
6-10 hours	38	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	4	1	9	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	1	1	0	3
11-20 hours	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	5	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
over 20 hours	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Conducting research																									
0 hours	1051	29	40	30	18	11	25	80	22	29	35	39	241	16	32	34	18	28	50	115	22	3	37	60	37
1-5 hours	823	26	24	37	15	15	18	54	20	24	26	28	190	11	24	21	17	30	23	96	30	6	19	39	30
6-10 hours	146	3	4	1	0	0	6	10	3	5	7	3	46	3	2	5	6	6	8	18	2	1	3	3	1
11-20 hours	44	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	1	17	1	2	0	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	1	2
over 20 hours	24	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	0
Attending ... meetings or conferences																									
0 hours	690	19	16	22	11	10	14	45	19	16	25	27	184	9	22	21	12	17	24	85	9	0	20	48	15
1-5 hours	1300	39	51	44	21	16	37	93	24	41	42	41	290	21	37	37	27	45	59	144	41	8	36	53	53
6-10 hours	62	2	2	1	2	0	0	3	3	1	2	3	18	1	2	3	2	1	3	3	4	1	2	1	2
11-20 hours	18	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	1	1	0	0
over 20 hours	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0

During a typical semester, what is the average number of hours you spend per week on each of the following activities?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Giving performances ... arts																									
0 hours	1886	57	64	57	31	24	47	138	44	56	63	68	442	30	54	57	37	59	79	210	53	9	53	95	59
1-5 hours	151	2	5	10	3	1	4	6	3	4	4	3	46	1	4	2	4	6	6	17	0	0	5	6	9
6-10 hours	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	0	2	2	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	1	1
11-20 hours	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
over 20 hours	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Recruiting																									
0 hours	1108	35	25	13	12	15	35	67	33	35	37	43	331	14	27	41	18	15	22	124	28	8	28	67	35
1-5 hours	865	22	42	49	18	10	14	68	12	24	27	27	155	15	29	19	20	42	54	101	23	1	30	33	30
6-10 hours	84	2	3	5	2	1	2	8	1	0	4	3	12	2	5	1	3	8	5	5	3	1	2	2	4
11-20 hours	21	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	0
over 20 hours	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0
Taking courses ... toward an advanced																									
0 hours	1495	43	57	45	25	20	38	109	33	48	56	59	364	21	37	50	28	42	60	147	35	8	40	86	44
1-5 hours	432	14	11	17	7	6	9	26	9	9	11	10	101	7	17	8	12	18	17	57	17	2	13	14	20
6-10 hours	111	3	1	5	2	0	4	6	1	3	1	2	22	2	6	3	2	4	8	24	2	0	5	2	3
11-20 hours	24	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	2	0	1
over 20 hours	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2
Giving speeches																									
0 hours	1462	45	49	39	27	17	40	102	36	38	49	41	376	19	41	46	28	40	58	163	39	2	46	74	47
1-5 hours	576	13	19	28	5	9	11	41	11	21	17	28	116	13	19	15	11	24	26	68	11	6	14	27	23
6-10 hours	24	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	2	0	1	0
11-20 hours	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
over 20 hours	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0

During a typical semester, what is the average number of hours you spend per week on each of the following activities?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Doing community service work																									
0 hours	485	11	12	13	5	8	11	27	13	16	8	14	157	4	14	10	8	6	17	62	10	6	14	32	7
1-5 hours	1358	42	52	48	23	18	36	100	27	42	54	49	286	27	41	47	29	53	53	136	38	3	40	61	53
6-10 hours	179	7	4	3	5	0	4	16	6	1	6	7	37	1	4	4	3	4	10	28	5	1	4	9	10
11-20 hours	47	0	1	2	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	14	0	2	1	3	2	3	7	1	0	2	0	0
over 20 hours	12	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
Attending workshops... to improve ...																									
0 hours	691	12	21	19	16	12	20	35	18	21	22	25	150	9	15	31	18	22	31	80	15	3	28	54	14
1-5 hours	1318	46	49	44	18	14	31	102	29	38	44	46	323	22	44	31	20	41	54	147	38	6	30	46	55
6-10 hours	55	2	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	1	2	2	21	1	2	0	4	2	1	6	0	0	1	1	1
11-20 hours	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
over 20 hours	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Outside paid employment																									
0 hours	1549	44	52	50	22	19	35	101	32	43	55	58	362	27	48	46	36	51	63	181	46	7	43	73	55
1-5 hours	357	9	8	13	7	5	12	31	12	11	8	12	93	3	6	11	7	9	18	33	6	2	13	19	9
6-10 hours	106	5	5	4	4	2	2	6	3	5	4	2	24	2	4	2	0	4	3	10	2	1	3	6	3
11-20 hours	43	0	4	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	12	0	2	2	0	1	1	8	1	0	1	1	2
over 20 hours	26	0	1	1	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	1

77

During a typical semester, what is the average number of hours you spend per week on each of the following activities?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Doing work related to a professional																									
0 hours	1137	32	35	37	18	14	29	65	29	37	33	38	304	17	38	30	23	24	46	135	20	4	35	61	33
1-5 hours	877	25	34	28	14	11	19	75	15	23	35	33	182	14	22	29	17	40	37	94	30	6	23	35	36
6-10 hours	43	1	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	0	0	2	10	1	1	2	0	1	2	2	3	0	1	4	1
11-20 hours	15	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	0
over 20 hours	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Reading professional journals																									
0 hours	207	4	9	6	1	5	5	10	4	6	3	8	61	2	8	4	5	5	11	22	5	1	8	12	2
1-5 hours	1695	54	52	59	27	20	42	123	40	49	59	62	387	27	42	50	36	51	72	190	47	9	49	85	63
6-10 hours	145	2	7	2	4	0	4	8	2	6	5	3	44	1	7	7	1	8	2	19	3	0	2	4	4
11-20 hours	26	0	1	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	2	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	1	2	0
over 20 hours	12	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
Teaching overload																									
0 hours	1195	50	43	32	18	21	29	58	26	35	32	47	289	25	27	54	28	35	52	98	41	10	38	55	52
1-5 hours	774	10	22	32	14	4	22	70	17	24	31	24	185	6	25	6	15	26	29	120	13	0	15	46	18
6-10 hours	98	0	4	3	1	2	0	16	3	3	4	3	21	0	8	1	0	3	3	15	1	0	5	2	0
11-20 hours	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
over 20 hours	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Interacting with outside agencies																									
0 hours	642	15	23	9	5	3	17	42	18	18	17	24	205	7	12	24	13	9	19	81	17	0	11	37	16
1-5 hours	1152	38	36	47	19	21	27	82	22	34	46	40	243	20	37	33	23	45	47	125	25	5	41	52	44
6-10 hours	195	4	8	6	7	1	5	16	3	9	5	5	33	3	7	3	4	8	16	21	7	2	6	8	8
11-20 hours	61	1	2	2	1	0	1	5	3	1	1	2	14	2	3	1	1	3	1	6	2	3	2	4	0
over 20 hours	25	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	1	0	2	1	3	0	1	1	2

Indicate the number of years it has been since you participated in the following activities.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Attended a conference ... in my field																									
3 years or fewer	1962	59	65	64	33	28	49	140	47	60	64	70	462	31	58	57	38	64	83	218	51	10	52	92	67
4-6 years	81	1	3	5	2	0	2	10	1	0	0	3	22	0	2	4	2	1	1	12	1	0	1	8	0
7-9 years	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0
10 years or more	27	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	4	3	0
not applicable	30	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	10	1	1	1	2	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	3
Taken educational leave or a sabbatical																									
3 years or fewer	202	4	6	5	3	4	3	15	2	3	6	8	62	5	8	13	4	4	9	19	4	1	4	6	4
4-6 years	82	3	1	1	1	2	2	5	0	1	2	5	35	0	0	3	0	4	2	2	3	0	2	5	3
7-9 years	50	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	5	12	0	1	1	1	3	2	5	2	1	1	3	5
10 years or more	599	19	30	16	11	5	14	47	9	10	19	23	146	6	12	26	13	13	31	59	17	3	20	35	15
not applicable	1181	36	32	46	19	16	30	82	36	47	41	34	260	21	39	19	25	42	42	151	29	5	[illegible]	53	43
Engaged in scholarly ... contribution to my field																									
3 years or fewer	780	25	22	17	4	11	17	54	18	21	23	25	244	11	25	31	11	13	39	82	19	4	18	25	21
4-6 years	204	4	6	3	4	2	9	13	5	9	8	13	43	5	4	11	5	7	6	16	7	2	5	9	8
7-9 years	131	2	1	3	5	0	6	9	3	2	5	3	32	1	2	6	3	4	5	12	5	1	5	12	4
10 years or more	399	10	23	22	8	6	7	35	4	6	11	16	84	5	9	10	6	14	21	40	6	2	9	33	12
not applicable	599	21	18	23	15	9	12	40	18	24	22	19	109	10	21	5	17	27	15	86	16	1	23	24	24

Indicate the number of years it has been since you participated in the following activities.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Participated in an internship or exchange program																									
3 years or fewer	298	9	17	7	4	3	12	23	6	4	13	9	61	6	6	10	8	4	17	44	5	1	6	15	8
4-6 years	74	3	0	1	3	1	5	7	1	2	1	1	16	1	2	1	2	1	4	6	0	0	0	9	7
7-9 years	52	3	0	4	3	0	1	6	0	2	0	1	11	1	1	1	0	3	4	3	1	0	1	4	2
10 years or more	435	12	25	12	5	7	6	31	10	9	17	11	114	5	12	16	7	10	16	44	11	6	19	19	11
not applicable	1248	35	29	44	21	16	27	83	30	45	38	52	309	18	40	33	26	48	44	138	38	3	34	56	41
Developed a new course																									
3 years or fewer	1198	37	39	30	17	11	34	85	28	34	41	44	289	16	38	37	28	43	54	137	27	2	34	54	39
4-6 years	234	10	7	11	7	2	2	18	5	8	7	7	59	4	8	13	1	6	4	22	6	1	6	14	6
7-9 years	106	3	4	3	2	4	4	5	3	2	3	3	30	1	1	2	1	0	3	21	1	0	2	6	2
10 years or more	168	5	11	8	0	4	4	14	1	4	2	6	38	4	4	5	5	3	6	18	6	2	3	10	5
not applicable	403	7	10	16	10	7	7	27	9	14	16	15	94	6	10	6	8	13	19	40	14	5	14	19	17
Significantly revised a course ... In my field																									
3 years or fewer	1409	40	46	45	23	14	37	108	32	39	50	51	351	21	41	39	21	46	61	163	32	2	39	62	46
4-6 years	150	5	6	3	5	4	4	13	2	3	2	8	31	1	3	9	2	3	4	24	5	0	4	6	3
7-9 years	52	2	1	4	1	1	4	1	0	1	0	1	11	0	0	2	4	2	1	6	2	1	1	4	2
10 years or more	85	1	5	4	1	2	1	4	1	2	3	2	23	3	0	3	0	0	4	9	1	0	2	9	5
not applicable	416	14	12	12	6	7	5	24	10	17	14	14	96	7	17	9	16	15	16	35	14	7	14	21	14

Indicate the number of years it has been since you participated in the following activities.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Significantly revised a course ... technology																									
3 years or fewer	1319	37	43	43	20	16	39	102	29	36	48	55	321	19	45	32	27	43	56	145	31	2	37	48	45
4-6 years	138	4	6	4	5	3	4	8	4	2	2	3	32	1	1	8	1	4	6	20	4	0	3	11	2
7-9 years	45	0	2	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	14	0	1	3	1	1	2	6	2	1	2	1	1
10 years or more	85	2	6	4	0	2	0	7	2	2	4	3	13	1	0	4	0	1	3	11	2	0	3	10	5
Not applicable	525	19	12	15	11	7	6	31	11	22	15	14	131	11	13	16	14	17	19	54	15	7	15	33	17
Significantly revised a course ... general ed.																									
3 years or fewer	912	28	32	23	14	9	34	66	21	25	30	29	217	16	43	21	15	33	37	101	22	0	38	32	26
4-6 years	222	4	10	12	5	3	5	9	3	5	11	6	54	3	4	10	4	5	14	29	9	1	3	9	4
7-9 years	60	1	1	2	2	0	2	4	1	0	1	0	18	0	0	6	1	2	5	5	0	1	1	4	3
10 years or more	139	4	8	6	3	3	1	11	3	4	5	4	26	1	1	6	0	0	2	22	4	1	2	17	5
not applicable	758	25	19	25	11	12	8	59	19	28	22	36	190	12	12	19	22	25	27	76	18	7	16	40	30
Completed a university credit course																									
3 years or fewer	674	23	16	34	14	9	16	40	14	15	23	22	127	11	32	11	15	24	38	96	19	3	21	16	35
4-6 years	338	9	8	9	8	6	12	20	7	12	16	13	68	9	13	9	8	11	15	29	10	0	15	21	10
7-9 years	244	6	8	5	7	5	5	14	6	8	5	8	63	4	6	9	5	7	8	28	5	2	4	15	11
10 years or more	674	21	31	18	5	8	12	63	16	21	18	25	183	6	7	31	11	17	22	63	18	5	14	46	13
not applicable	183	3	7	3	2	0	6	15	4	6	7	7	70	2	2	2	3	7	2	20	3	0	6	5	1
Participated in ... teaching experiment																									
3 years or fewer	1172	34	44	40	23	14	36	79	28	32	46	49	287	25	30	31	27	44	49	119	29	2	25	38	41
4-6 years	198	6	7	7	4	3	4	11	3	8	1	8	57	0	7	8	0	0	12	25	6	2	6	13	2
7-9 years	71	3	2	1	0	0	2	7	2	0	2	2	17	1	3	2	1	2	7	7	4	0	1	4	1
10 years or more	177	3	6	6	3	2	2	16	1	5	3	2	39	2	2	13	2	1	7	24	6	0	9	17	6
not applicable	491	16	11	15	6	9	7	35	13	17	17	17	109	4	19	9	13	19	9	61	9	6	19	31	20

Indicate the number of years it has been since you participated in the following activities.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Had an article published ...																									
3 years or fewer	301	10	7	5	2	4	6	15	8	11	7	9	97	2	12	14	5	7	19	29	10	4	4	7	7
4-6 years	134	4	1	3	2	0	4	16	5	4	7	7	35	3	1	2	3	5	6	9	3	1	6	5	2
7-9 years	99	2	1	3	2	1	5	10	4	1	0	0	29	1	1	12	2	1	3	8	4	0	2	3	4
10 years or more	543	14	28	19	6	4	10	48	2	11	19	19	142	7	9	23	6	16	1	56	13	3	14	37	16
Not applicable	1020	32	33	39	24	19	26	59	26	34	36	39	206	19	37	12	26	37	35	135	25	2	33	48	38
Authored ... published book in my field																									
3 years or fewer	250	7	9	6	4	1	7	18	4	7	8	10	80	3	6	10	3	1	5	30	11	2	3	8	7
4-6 years	92	1	1	3	1	0	0	11	4	1	4	4	30	2	2	1	0	2	4	10	3	0	1	5	2
7-9 years	57	1	3	2	1	0	2	4	0	0	1	2	19	0	1	3	0	1	4	6	2	0	1	3	1
10 years or more	418	12	20	17	4	4	6	30	4	7	9	9	115	10	8	18	5	11	22	43	6	5	16	24	13
not applicable	1285	41	37	41	26	23	36	86	34	47	47	50	261	17	43	31	35	51	50	147	33	3	39	61	46
Applied ... for research grant																									
3 years or fewer	392	11	12	5	5	6	14	37	8	9	10	12	110	6	11	15	4	5	27	42	13	2	8	7	13
4-6 years	100	0	2	4	1	2	4	8	3	5	2	3	26	2	1	4	2	2	5	9	3	0	0	7	5
7-9 years	67	2	1	2	2	1	1	4	1	2	1	6	21	1	1	6	0	1	5	5	0	0	1	3	0
10 years or more	342	14	22	12	2	3	5	17	3	5	12	13	90	5	5	15	9	8	12	34	9	3	13	22	9
not applicable	1178	33	33	45	25	16	27	79	31	41	44	40	252	18	41	22	27	50	35	146	29	5	37	61	41
Participated in planning ... conference, etc.																									
3 years or fewer	1374	48	46	43	20	21	32	89	28	45	41	51	339	26	43	41	31	41	65	143	40	10	28	53	53
4-6 years	192	3	5	3	4	1	5	20	6	6	7	8	42	2	6	8	2	6	8	25	4	0	7	9	5
7-9 years	86	1	4	5	0	0	2	4	3	0	1	4	25	1	0	8	1	1	2	7	1	0	4	12	0
10 years or more	163	2	8	6	4	2	2	13	1	2	7	4	43	0	1	3	4	2	4	27	2	0	6	13	7
not applicable	292	8	11	12	8	4	10	26	9	8	13	8	57	3	11	2	4	14	6	35	8	0	14	16	5

Indicate the number of years it has been since you participated in the following activities.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Participated in colloquy ...																									
3 years or fewer	1134	37	37	33	13	17	32	75	25	39	37	41	283	24	31	46	24	31	47	124	30	8	23	38	39
4-6 years	190	4	5	3	7	3	7	15	3	6	4	3	45	2	6	5	2	7	11	21	6	0	9	11	5
7-9 years	57	1	0	3	3	0	1	5	1	1	4	3	10	0	0	3	1	4	2	7	5	0	0	1	2
10 years or more	199	2	17	5	2	3	1	18	1	4	7	9	43	2	2	4	3	4	10	22	6	2	9	15	8
Not applicable	527	18	11	24	11	5	10	35	17	12	17	19	127	4	22	4	13	20	15	64	8	0	19	36	16
Served on a prof. committee outside ...																									
3 years or fewer	1159	38	49	43	20	19	26	82	22	34	44	44	239	24	34	40	22	36	53	111	37	8	35	48	51
4-6 years	206	7	3	3	2	0	8	18	4	7	4	11	49	5	8	11	6	6	9	21	6	1	3	9	5
7-9 years	92	0	3	2	3	2	4	4	6	2	2	5	17	2	1	2	5	3	4	8	2	0	4	6	5
10 years or more	203	1	9	5	3	3	5	16	3	3	8	5	64	0	3	4	2	8	6	30	4	0	2	16	3
not applicable	445	16	8	16	8	4	8	28	12	15	11	10	134	1	15	5	8	12	13	68	6	1	17	24	5

Will you pursue professional development in the upcoming year?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Yes	1845	53	59	63	30	24	47	136	42	57	58	66	452	28	50	53	38	58	76	197	53	10	51	82	64
No	162	4	6	4	5	2	4	6	4	2	6	2	30	4	7	7	3	5	8	25	1	0	7	18	2

Indicate the importance to you of the following professional goals.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Become more effective at my job																									
Unimportant	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	0
Somewhat unimportant	13	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
Somewhat important	68	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	4	6	0	2	25	0	2	1	3	3	0	4	0	0	1	6	1
Important	2023	58	69	68	34	25	48	148	43	56	68	73	483	31	58	60	40	63	85	228	53	10	56	97	69
Not a goal	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Become more knowledgeable in my job																									
Unimportant	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Somewhat unimportant	13	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Somewhat important	125	6	3	3	0	3	1	10	3	9	1	6	37	2	3	4	0	5	2	10	2	0	2	10	3
Important	1967	53	67	66	36	23	46	142	43	53	68	69	468	30	56	59	42	60	83	224	51	10	57	94	67
Not a goal	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Obtain a higher degree																									
Unimportant	237	8	11	8	5	2	6	19	5	6	5	14	51	2	8	9	3	0	5	27	8	3	11	14	7
Somewhat unimportant	164	5	3	4	6	2	1	11	3	9	4	7	36	4	2	4	4	5	8	22	2	1	7	11	3
Somewhat important	314	13	11	18	5	5	6	20	10	11	11	15	54	5	9	6	5	12	18	39	11	1	6	13	10
Important	366	6	11	9	7	9	9	26	8	9	11	6	80	5	14	5	13	21	23	49	12	1	10	7	15
Not a goal	964	28	33	28	12	10	24	68	22	27	35	32	271	14	27	36	18	24	29	90	22	3	26	53	32
Obtain higher rank																									
Unimportant	189	3	10	8	4	3	3	15	4	2	5	9	44	2	7	8	1	0	6	22	7	1	8	12	5
Somewhat unimportant	140	4	3	4	4	1	3	7	2	5	5	9	36	3	2	2	3	4	2	16	4	2	6	9	4
Somewhat important	363	13	12	10	6	5	10	23	11	15	13	12	73	4	9	13	5	17	22	41	11	2	10	14	12
Important	622	17	15	21	10	12	14	44	15	21	17	18	135	9	20	7	19	27	32	83	18	1	13	28	26
Not a goal	734	23	29	24	11	6	16	52	16	19	28	25	206	12	21	30	15	17	21	65	15	4	23	35	21

Indicate the importance to you of the following professional goals.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Obtain an administrative position																									
Unimportant	348	16	18	10	12	1	11	25	7	8	10	14	77	6	5	12	6	6	12	44	7	0	12	19	10
Somewhat unimportant	131	1	2	3	1	2	4	11	4	0	6	6	37	3	1	3	2	5	9	15	8	0	2	2	4
Somewhat important	143	4	3	4	4	4	0	11	3	3	2	5	38	3	2	2	3	5	11	16	3	1	7	6	3
Important	112	0	3	3	0	1	3	11	3	2	2	2	19	0	5	1	4	9	1	21	6	0	2	7	4
Not a goal	1232	35	42	43	17	16	31	79	30	44	42	44	310	15	43	43	27	38	40	126	28	7	34	61	37
Obtain a position at a four-year college																									
Unimportant	409	17	19	15	9	3	14	30	10	11	12	16	87	8	8	12	4	8	18	51	10	0	13	22	12
Somewhat unimportant	153	1	4	7	4	2	1	9	4	4	2	3	37	2	3	6	5	10	7	20	8	1	1	7	5
Somewhat important	161	2	1	1	5	1	5	12	5	5	6	5	47	1	5	5	7	3	4	16	10	2	2	6	5
Important	93	2	2	1	1	3	2	7	6	3	1	4	25	1	1	0	6	4	3	10	2	0	5	1	3
Not a goal	1253	35	44	44	17	17	27	86	22	39	46	46	306	19	44	39	21	41	52	130	23	7	39	65	44
Obtain a position in a non-academic setting																									
Unimportant	399	15	15	10	7	2	10	31	8	9	12	18	89	9	8	7	7	13	16	56	9	0	14	21	13
Somewhat unimportant	142	3	5	8	3	2	1	7	1	4	3	2	33	2	3	8	8	7	9	15	5	2	2	6	3
Somewhat important	137	2	1	5	5	2	1	10	6	6	3	5	33	2	4	6	2	6	6	7	8	2	2	7	6
Important	81	1	2	3	3	2	1	7	1	2	3	3	29	1	2	1	1	1	3	7	1	1	2	1	3
Not a goal	1293	36	45	41	17	17	35	88	30	41	46	46	314	17	44	40	25	39	49	142	30	5	38	65	43

Indicate the importance to you of the following professional goals.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Obtain a full-time teaching position																									
Unimportant	103	3	10	2	3	1	2	7	1	0	3	4	20	3	6	1	3	2	9	8	2	0	5	5	3
Somewhat unimportant	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
Somewhat important	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Important	38	1	1	1	1	0	1	4	1	0	3	0	6	0	3	0	2	2	0	7	0	0	2	3	0
Not a goal	1350	38	43	38	20	20	39	89	35	41	46	49	345	18	36	46	25	43	52	138	32	7	41	64	45

How likely is it that you will actually pursue each of the following if given the opportunity?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
University credit courses																									
Unlikely	569	16	27	15	4	6	14	43	15	14	18	18	168	6	12	18	11	10	16	51	12	5	22	34	14
Somewhat unlikely	240	6	8	9	2	4	5	19	6	8	6	7	61	2	3	15	4	9	9	17	10	1	4	20	5
Somewhat likely	374	15	13	15	8	2	9	26	6	10	15	14	83	8	11	14	7	6	15	42	5	2	15	18	15
Likely	852	23	19	28	22	16	21	60	18	26	27	33	169	15	35	15	20	38	41	117	27	2	19	27	34
Does not apply	89	2	5	2	0	0	1	5	2	4	3	3	31	1	0	1	1	3	5	10	1	0	2	5	2
Non-credit courses																									
Unlikely	357	8	12	8	4	5	2	18	2	10	11	12	85	5	8	14	7	9	11	52	17	2	25	26	4
Somewhat unlikely	249	4	8	4	2	2	8	14	5	16	8	13	59	5	6	8	6	10	10	27	8	1	7	13	5
Somewhat likely	559	12	20	27	10	7	18	29	10	18	20	17	130	8	14	18	15	15	29	55	11	4	12	31	29
Likely	903	35	31	29	20	14	21	89	30	17	29	30	216	14	32	23	13	31	34	94	19	3	16	32	31
Does not apply	50	3	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	2	19	0	0	0	2	1	2	8	0	0	2	2	1

How likely is it that you will actually pursue each of the following if given the opportunity?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Professional conferences																									
Unlikely	42	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	10	0	1	0	2	0	1	10	1	0	3	3	0
Somewhat unlikely	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	3	11	2	2	0	1	2	2	4	0	0	1	2	0
Somewhat likely	239	3	6	6	2	4	7	16	4	7	7	9	62	4	9	6	4	2	10	38	5	2	6	19	1
Likely	1805	58	61	63	34	24	42	135	41	54	60	64	427	26	49	57	36	62	73	183	48	8	52	80	68
Does not apply	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
College sponsored presentations ...																									
Unlikely	62	2	7	3	0	0	0	6	0	3	2	1	11	0	0	0	3	2	0	11	2	0	3	5	1
Somewhat unlikely	68	0	6	2	0	0	3	4	2	3	2	3	17	1	1	2	0	3	3	7	2	0	1	6	0
Somewhat likely	315	4	8	14	4	5	5	25	4	4	8	9	85	4	10	7	5	5	11	51	6	3	13	19	6
Likely	1669	56	51	49	32	23	42	117	41	52	57	63	392	27	50	54	35	56	72	167	45	7	45	74	62
Does not apply	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Internship or exchange in business/industry																									
Unlikely	761	24	24	20	6	12	15	61	14	27	19	23	200	9	21	21	18	19	21	90	15	4	27	45	26
Somewhat unlikely	355	12	13	13	10	2	9	25	8	8	10	10	84	8	12	7	8	14	11	43	7	3	10	15	13
Somewhat likely	284	11	13	10	8	1	10	19	5	9	10	11	56	5	12	11	3	10	14	25	10	0	9	11	11
Likely	424	8	18	11	9	10	11	28	10	10	14	14	95	6	7	12	10	15	26	57	15	2	7	18	11
Does not apply	289	7	4	14	3	3	5	19	11	8	15	18	71	3	9	12	4	8	13	21	8	1	9	15	8
Academic exchange																									
Unlikely	847	27	26	31	15	15	19	64	17	29	23	35	195	13	28	25	16	26	25	98	13	3	25	53	26
Somewhat unlikely	394	10	15	15	7	3	17	23	11	13	14	12	99	7	7	13	8	10	23	42	8	2	10	14	11
Somewhat likely	336	15	13	8	5	3	2	18	6	8	12	15	80	5	13	8	3	10	12	44	10	4	9	14	19
Likely	398	8	14	8	9	3	9	36	10	6	14	11	100	3	9	14	14	15	16	41	17	0	11	18	12
Does not apply	136	2	2	7	0	3	3	11	4	6	6	2	34	3	4	3	2	5	9	11	7	0	7	4	1

How likely is it that you will actually pursue each of the following if given the opportunity?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Research and scholarship																									
Unlikely	501	12	21	19	11	4	8	45	12	16	16	23	94	10	19	10	12	14	20	58	8	2	18	32	17
Somewhat unlikely	408	16	17	12	7	3	15	26	7	7	15	12	99	6	12	13	6	14	10	45	9	3	13	23	18
Somewhat likely	459	13	15	21	5	8	7	34	9	17	15	18	110	4	13	12	9	11	19	51	13	3	16	22	14
Likely	659	18	18	13	13	9	19	41	17	20	18	19	186	8	13	26	14	24	33	70	22	2	12	24	20
Does not apply	84	3	1	4	0	3	1	6	3	2	5	2	17	4	4	1	2	3	3	11	3	0	3	3	0
Formal colloquia or symposia with ...																									
Unlikely	344	10	19	12	9	5	6	32	9	4	12	13	63	6	15	3	8	12	14	42	3	0	14	22	11
Somewhat unlikely	322	15	12	11	6	4	7	20	5	11	9	11	77	2	8	8	6	8	8	36	8	1	11	22	16
Somewhat likely	628	15	21	31	13	13	16	37	15	21	19	27	142	10	17	20	8	18	33	73	14	5	14	30	16
Likely	754	20	19	11	8	5	20	55	16	24	26	23	208	10	19	31	20	26	28	80	28	4	21	26	26
Does not apply	65	2	0	4	0	1	1	6	2	2	3	2	16	3	2	1	1	2	3	6	2	0	2	4	0
Summer institutes, workshops, etc.																									
Unlikely	372	8	18	16	9	5	10	32	6	11	7	9	85	5	9	7	9	8	10	46	5	2	18	25	12
Somewhat unlikely	304	8	13	10	2	6	9	23	6	10	10	12	74	3	11	10	7	10	12	21	4	3	13	18	9
Somewhat likely	541	11	17	22	10	8	11	30	13	20	16	18	132	8	13	18	9	18	25	68	18	2	9	27	18
Likely	836	31	24	16	15	9	20	62	20	20	33	35	204	15	27	27	16	29	35	91	26	3	19	30	29
Does not apply	53	4	0	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3	1	10	1	1	1	2	1	4	7	2	0	3	3	1

When you decide not to participate in prof. development, ... which of the following tends to be the single greatest factor?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Lack of interest	217	6	16	13	4	1	5	13	2	18	6	6	46	6	5	6	5	7	7	20	8	1	8	5	5
Inconvenient due to	226	9	4	8	4	3	5	8	6	7	7	8	58	1	8	9	5	8	14	24	7	4	8	6	7
personal circumstances	495	2	20	11	5	8	11	40	10	4	13	13	129	5	5	18	10	17	18	66	9	1	18	48	14
Lack of money	903	36	17	27	18	10	20	68	23	28	40	41	207	15	36	26	12	25	40	96	26	4	22	33	33
Lack of time	132	6	10	4	1	1	6	11	5	2	2	2	29	2	3	3	4	8	3	12	3	0	3	5	7
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Credit courses																									
Ineffective	223	8	12	8	6	8	3	22	3	4	3	10	55	1	7	5	2	3	8	28	4	0	10	7	6
Somewhat ineffective	207	10	5	7	3	1	4	12	6	8	9	10	53	2	3	6	5	4	11	17	4	2	7	14	4
Somewhat effective	619	14	19	21	10	6	17	39	11	16	20	24	130	15	22	22	12	23	24	71	21	4	16	31	31
Effective	662	23	19	24	13	10	18	54	16	15	25	19	138	11	23	12	19	26	30	84	21	1	17	25	19
Have not pursued	404	7	17	9	4	3	8	25	11	19	12	13	131	3	6	17	5	10	12	36	5	3	12	27	9

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Non-credit courses																									
Ineffective	117	4	3	4	0	0	1	12	1	2	3	5	26	1	2	4	2	1	7	19	7	0	7	4	2
Somewhat ineffective	168	2	6	5	4	2	7	8	4	5	5	3	35	4	5	5	3	7	5	20	7	2	9	10	5
Somewhat effective	697	21	22	24	13	9	18	36	9	16	23	27	165	12	25	18	15	25	33	84	20	4	20	30	28
Effective	747	30	31	32	15	15	15	76	23	19	26	26	181	11	22	17	15	21	26	65	10	2	10	31	28
Have not pursued	382	5	10	4	4	2	9	18	10	20	12	15	100	4	7	17	8	11	13	49	11	2	16	29	6

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC BO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Professional conferences																									
Ineffective	23	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	1	1	0
Somewhat ineffective	75	2	2	2	2	1	1	6	6	2	4	1	16	1	2	5	2	0	3	11	2	1	1	2	0
Somewhat effective	464	11	16	17	8	7	12	33	6	12	12	16	120	7	17	9	15	17	16	57	9	3	11	24	9
Effective	1531	48	51	49	26	20	37	111	34	47	52	59	358	24	41	49	26	47	66	156	41	6	48	74	61
Have not pursued	34	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	11	0	1	0	0	2	1	8	1	0	1	3	0
On-campus presentations																									
Ineffective	134	2	4	8	2	2	1	18	3	7	2	1	34	0	0	0	3	6	4	18	4	0	6	5	4
Somewhat ineffective	189	1	7	9	3	3	6	16	7	5	3	2	44	0	5	7	5	5	10	20	8	1	3	13	6
Somewhat effective	897	23	29	29	23	12	24	50	20	22	26	32	213	18	27	34	15	29	35	98	27	4	29	49	29
Effective	861	34	31	23	7	11	19	67	15	27	33	41	210	14	28	21	19	24	34	96	16	5	20	35	31
Have not pursued	39	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	0	0	4	2	0
Internships or exchanges																									
Ineffective	99	5	7	4	2	1	1	11	2	4	2	3	22	1	4	2	3	0	5	8	4	0	3	3	2
Somewhat ineffective	67	1	1	1	0	2	2	11	2	0	3	2	12	1	3	1	1	0	1	13	1	1	3	5	0
Somewhat effective	285	11	14	10	7	4	12	24	4	8	8	7	57	7	5	5	8	9	13	28	8	0	8	19	9
Effective	443	11	21	12	8	7	12	29	11	10	17	19	93	2	8	18	9	20	24	52	12	2	14	19	13
Have not pursued	1215	34	29	42	19	13	23	76	28	39	38	44	322	21	41	35	22	37	42	135	30	7	34	58	46
Research and scholarship																									
Ineffective	99	4	6	2	2	0	1	14	3	3	3	1	20	1	4	3	0	3	4	11	4	0	2	6	2
Somewhat ineffective	130	5	4	4	2	3	4	15	5	5	2	9	24	3	5	3	4	2	4	12	1	1	2	4	7
Somewhat effective	466	15	19	20	6	5	16	26	7	14	16	18	107	6	9	9	6	15	19	55	9	5	17	32	15
Effective	779	19	24	16	9	11	18	51	15	23	24	25	230	10	16	31	15	22	32	81	27	3	20	35	22
Have not pursued	636	19	19	27	16	9	11	44	17	17	23	23	126	12	27	17	18	24	25	75	14	1	21	27	24

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Site visits																									
Ineffective	74	4	5	2	2	3	0	8	2	2	0	1	17	1	1	1	3	0	1	9	5	0	5	0	2
Somewhat ineffective	103	1	4	6	2	0	5	7	3	5	1	3	20	2	2	5	3	2	2	15	0	1	5	7	2
Somewhat effective	584	15	21	25	10	6	14	40	9	15	25	20	133	14	21	18	8	17	20	58	18	4	18	34	21
Effective	856	25	32	32	16	12	20	64	16	25	29	39	180	9	23	27	16	40	49	84	24	5	20	37	32
Have not pursued	496	16	10	4	6	7	11	31	18	15	14	12	155	6	14	12	13	7	14	70	8	0	14	26	13
Formal colloquia or symposia																									
Ineffective	73	4	3	2	3	1	2	8	1	2	1	4	14	0	1	0	2	3	3	8	2	0	2	5	2
Somewhat ineffective	159	4	4	8	3	1	4	15	8	5	4	4	33	5	3	2	3	2	6	18	4	1	8	8	6
Somewhat effective	709	17	25	20	13	8	21	42	17	18	19	27	183	12	25	21	14	16	29	88	23	5	14	38	14
Effective	765	24	23	23	10	14	19	55	12	23	31	27	192	10	15	30	17	23	32	73	20	4	23	31	34
Have not pursued	402	13	17	15	7	4	4	30	9	14	13	14	84	5	17	9	7	22	14	48	6	0	15	21	14
Informal conversations with colleagues																									
Ineffective	45	2	2	0	3	1	0	4	1	1	0	1	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	8	2	0	2	3	2
Somewhat ineffective	109	2	3	3	2	0	4	7	3	3	6	1	27	2	1	3	2	3	6	10	6	1	4	5	5
Somewhat effective	812	19	28	22	14	9	20	70	19	21	24	27	177	12	31	30	16	28	37	99	14	5	27	44	19
Effective	1119	37	36	43	17	17	26	68	23	37	37	47	286	17	27	28	24	34	38	120	33	4	26	51	43
Have not pursued	28	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	9	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	1
Professional journals																									
Ineffective	25	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	1	1	1
Somewhat ineffective	106	2	1	5	2	0	2	3	2	3	3	3	24	1	2	2	0	2	9	17	4	2	3	6	2
Somewhat effective	778	25	26	32	11	13	25	53	18	24	23	27	179	18	23	23	16	25	28	76	15	4	25	43	26
Effective	1153	32	38	28	23	15	23	89	26	35	41	42	282	12	33	38	19	37	45	132	35	4	31	53	40
Have not pursued	54	3	5	3	0	0	0	4	2	0	1	2	15	1	2	0	1	2	2	6	1	0	2	1	1

Please rate the effectiveness of each of the following for keeping you up-to-date with new developments in your field.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Professional committee ... work																									
Ineffective	172	5	10	4	3	3	3	14	4	8	4	3	45	1	4	5	4	3	3	26	6	0	4	8	2
Somewhat ineffective	365	13	12	16	3	2	5	30	11	12	9	10	98	7	6	7	10	11	15	42	11	2	9	18	6
Somewhat effective	817	20	23	26	11	15	29	52	20	21	29	26	195	13	30	27	17	21	38	86	22	5	22	39	30
Effective	534	14	16	15	13	6	9	48	8	16	19	30	119	8	11	18	8	21	21	50	15	3	14	21	31
Have not pursued	221	8	11	8	6	1	3	8	3	5	8	7	49	3	8	6	4	10	9	32	1	0	13	17	1
Teleconferences																									
Ineffective	177	2	10	7	4	2	3	16	9	5	6	5	36	2	2	6	2	4	5	24	6	0	7	10	4
Somewhat ineffective	424	13	11	13	5	6	19	31	13	17	14	15	100	8	8	23	12	7	17	37	13	2	12	21	7
Somewhat effective	687	28	26	26	12	10	19	42	15	17	21	31	143	14	21	18	16	25	28	56	16	7	26	37	33
Effective	305	9	10	6	8	6	4	38	3	5	14	13	60	4	8	5	6	13	22	27	8	1	4	14	17
Have not pursued	518	10	15	17	7	4	5	24	7	18	12	11	169	4	22	11	7	17	12	91	11	0	13	22	9
Computer networks																									
Ineffective	92	0	7	3	3	2	1	9	3	4	0	1	22	1	2	2	2	2	0	12	2	0	7	6	1
Somewhat ineffective	232	7	7	1	2	1	11	16	6	7	11	9	47	7	5	7	7	8	10	26	11	2	17	10	4
Somewhat effective	749	24	29	27	15	8	18	56	15	26	22	35	161	12	22	17	19	26	31	80	12	5	18	41	30
Effective	617	21	19	17	8	13	14	47	10	13	28	23	139	8	18	21	9	20	28	62	19	3	16	32	29
Have not pursued	410	9	10	17	7	3	6	22	13	12	7	8	138	4	11	16	6	10	13	55	9	0	14	14	6

How would you describe the overall attitude of the administration at your institution towards professional development?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Strongly encourages	989	50	25	52	4	19	29	48	18	43	52	46	195	20	49	35	25	31	45	76	26	7	22	31	41
Mildly encourages	648	9	26	14	13	7	15	53	13	11	8	16	188	9	8	18	15	16	21	88	19	2	22	41	16
Neither encourages	282	1	15	3	11	1	4	27	15	5	3	9	62	2	2	6	2	9	11	57	1	0	12	18	6
nor discourages	93	0	3	0	5	0	0	11	2	1	1	4	33	0	1	1	0	2	1	11	5	0	4	5	3
Mildly discourages	49	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	17	1	0	1	0	5	3	2	4	0	2	5	1
Strongly discourages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

In your opinion, how adequate is your institution's financial support for the following?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Tuition reimbursement																									
Inadequate	514	3	17	14	9	3	8	52	3	13	10	7	171	5	7	6	7	19	11	77	5	0	22	36	9
Somewhat inadequate	323	4	14	10	5	1	7	25	8	10	9	6	97	6	5	15	5	17	7	41	7	0	5	11	8
Somewhat adequate	525	13	14	17	13	6	13	33	15	15	16	19	109	10	18	19	13	17	21	54	21	0	15	24	30
Adequate	487	33	18	23	8	13	15	21	10	18	23	32	56	9	27	14	16	9	34	36	17	8	16	16	15
Does not apply	218	5	9	5	0	3	3	16	10	5	8	9	66	2	2	6	2	3	10	27	4	1	4	14	4
Sabbaticals																									
Inadequate	548	18	26	15	15	14	12	46	13	14	10	19	129	7	12	7	14	13	22	74	7	0	20	26	15
Somewhat inadequate	315	10	1	8	6	2	7	28	8	9	10	12	74	2	7	14	3	10	9	34	16	1	8	9	13
Somewhat adequate	386	8	6	7	4	3	11	22	4	8	21	16	116	6	15	20	4	15	20	27	11	0	9	19	14
Adequate	291	6	9	5	1	1	7	19	2	8	9	14	94	2	5	14	4	15	10	24	9	3	10	17	3
Does not apply	502	15	13	33	8	6	8	32	18	20	17	14	83	15	18	6	17	11	22	67	11	5	13	30	20

In your opinion, how adequate is your institution's financial support for the following?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Educational leave																									
Inadequate	419	12	22	11	13	9	5	34	10	13	8	9	101	8	8	4	9	12	12	54	7	0	20	24	14
Somewhat inadequate	362	10	17	10	8	3	7	33	10	11	13	8	89	2	9	13	6	12	13	43	11	2	6	13	13
Somewhat adequate	465	13	6	16	6	5	15	23	4	7	20	21	136	3	16	25	7	11	22	41	16	0	12	22	18
Adequate	371	8	11	11	3	3	9	25	6	13	10	21	91	5	11	15	6	21	20	23	10	6	11	20	12
Does not apply	416	13	12	20	5	5	9	31	16	14	16	15	81	13	14	4	14	9	17	60	10	1	8	21	8
Released time																									
Inadequate	613	8	28	7	12	5	7	58	12	10	12	16	231	9	6	15	7	24	25	51	17	0	17	23	13
Somewhat inadequate	357	10		14	8	1	5	27	16	9	11	12	88	4	6	14	4	10	16	44	9	0	8	17	10
Somewhat adequate	506	11	11	16	8	11	14	37	14	13	17	18	100	7	20	21	17	14	11	63	19	2	22	20	20
Adequate	387	22	10	18	3	6	16	17	2	19	18	18	39	6	22	11	12	11	25	50	8	4	7	26	17
Does not apply	191	7	8	11	4	3	3	9	3	9	8	10	41	5	4	1	3	8	6	20	1	3	5	16	5
Flexible scheduling ...																									
Inadequate	314	5	12	5	8	3	7	25	7	6	12	4	101	3	6	9	2	12	14	28	9	0	14	15	7
Somewhat inadequate	329	5	10	10	4	2	7	27	5	8	13	13	87	3	4	8	7	6	16	38	11	0	12	21	12
Somewhat adequate	588	13	22	18	11	7	14	44	17	16	16	24	143	11	10	24	14	18	22	58	16	4	18	29	19
Adequate	708	29	20	30	10	13	17	41	13	28	20	29	143	12	35	20	17	27	28	85	15	5	13	30	28
Does not apply	114	7	6	5	1	0	1	9	3	2	5	3	25	2	5	1	2	2	5	18	4	0	2	4	2
Professional association memberships																									
Inadequate	1088	23	44	31	22	7	17	85	22	15	29	25	355	13	15	35	22	34	32	123	30	0	35	34	40
Somewhat inadequate	290	6	9	6	6	4	7	25	9	8	14	17	50	5	6	10	8	12	13	30	6	0	8	22	9
Somewhat adequate	242	4	6	12	3	5	7	21	4	9	6	11	30	5	11	12	5	7	12	21	10	2	8	25	6
Adequate	271	16	6	12	3	7	7	9	8	23	11	11	19	7	22	3	2	5	21	34	5	7	5	20	8
Does not apply	181	11	5	8	1	3	9	6	4	5	5	10	47	2	4	3	5	6	7	22	4	0	6	2	6

In your opinion, how adequate is your institution's financial support for the following?

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Registration fees ...																									
Inadequate	493	4	12	5	7	2	5	40	5	1	2	12	227	6	1	18	8	4	8	69	6	0	14	25	12
Somewhat inadequate	385	1	17	12	4	1	10	33	9	4	6	12	116	3	7	15	9	12	8	49	14	0	12	24	7
Somewhat adequate	557	7	17	15	14	4	15	44	20	18	30	26	94	6	12	19	13	22	29	62	16	2	21	32	19
Adequate	591	46	24	34	10	18	15	26	13	34	28	20	55	15	39	11	12	23	38	42	18	7	13	20	30
Does not apply	41	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	4	11	1	1	0	0	4	1	8	0	0	1	1	0
Travel expenses																									
Inadequate	582	3	21	4	8	2	7	54	9	4	2	15	250	4	2	21	11	3	8	87	10	0	14	32	11
Somewhat inadequate	382	3	18	11	6	0	12	38	5	4	8	8	104	4	6	17	6	11	12	45	15	0	15	25	9
Somewhat adequate	553	9	15	25	14	7	16	35	21	13	28	30	92	8	17	17	16	22	33	51	14	2	20	22	26
Adequate	505	37	17	29	6	17	10	19	12	38	28	19	42	14	32	7	10	25	32	39	14	7	12	19	20
Does not apply	33	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	11	1	0	0	0	4	0	8	1	0	0	1	0
Retraining ...																									
Inadequate	436	7	20	7	7	2	11	39	9	7	8	8	131	3	2	16	6	16	6	61	18	0	21	20	11
Somewhat inadequate	389	5	15	13	9	1	9	32	12	5	12	9	107	1	5	16	8	11	20	50	12	0	11	14	12
Somewhat adequate	579	18	16	21	13	7	17	36	11	20	21	24	144	12	15	14	13	22	25	53	15	3	12	27	20
Adequate	384	19	12	14	2	13	7	25	6	22	15	23	63	12	32	6	11	11	23	26	3	4	7	13	15
Does not apply	262	8	5	12	3	3	3	12	7	7	9	10	56	3	4	11	4	5	9	42	5	2	8	26	8
Training in computer skills																									
Inadequate	194	1	8	5	2	2	12	8	5	5	5	3	38	1	1	7	2	16	4	27	14	0	17	7	4
Somewhat inadequate	295	5	10	5	5	0	15	19	9	5	7	6	74	2	3	19	4	13	11	37	20	0	11	11	4
Somewhat adequate	670	10	22	12	12	6	12	44	17	16	27	18	187	9	11	24	18	23	28	89	12	1	20	26	26
Adequate	838	35	26	45	14	18	8	69	13	32	26	45	187	19	42	10	18	12	39	69	7	8	11	55	30
Does not apply	32	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	2	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	0	2	0	0

Assuming that institutional environment and professional development are interrelated, indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Morale at this institution is generally high																									
Strongly disagree	515	2	25	16	17	2	14	90	10	5	15	5	112	7	1	14	6	20	15	63	29	1	31	9	6
Mildly disagree	501	8	21	30	7	3	17	39	17	11	13	9	131	6	6	17	15	7	21	61	12	2	15	19	14
Mildly agree	692	30	17	18	8	15	11	14	20	25	23	19	184	15	21	22	16	27	26	77	13	4	12	43	32
Strongly agree	331	17	8	4	2	7	4	2	1	17	14	40	60	4	31	9	5	11	21	27	1	2	2	27	15
Neutral	45	3	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	16	0	1	1	0	1	1	7	0	0	1	3	2
There is a sense of community here																									
Strongly disagree	350	1	14	9	10	3	9	55	10	0	9	4	83	5	3	4	3	12	5	59	18	3	16	11	4
Mildly disagree	465	8	21	15	11	5	10	53	10	5	13	6	104	8	3	16	14	8	18	63	18	1	22	23	10
Mildly agree	726	22	24	26	9	10	20	32	25	25	25	14	185	7	20	25	14	24	23	82	16	3	17	42	36
Strongly agree	517	30	11	19	4	9	7	5	3	30	19	49	123	11	32	18	11	21	38	28	2	2	4	22	19
Neutral	27	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	2	4	0
Professionals here respect each other																									
Strongly disagree	152	0	6	5	8	0	2	12	6	2	6	5	30	0	1	1	3	7	4	19	12	2	12	6	3
Mildly disagree	282	5	6	13	7	5	6	33	8	2	16	2	59	3	4	6	10	6	12	41	13	1	7	12	5
Mildly agree	880	27	30	27	15	9	32	76	23	21	24	30	199	12	21	25	19	26	32	104	17	1	30	48	32
Strongly agree	735	26	29	24	3	13	7	23	10	32	19	36	213	17	31	29	10	24	35	67	12	5	10	34	26
Neutral	32	2	0	0	2	1	0	4	1	2	1	0	6	0	0	2	1	2	1	3	1	0	1	2	0
There is a sense of collegiality at this institution																									
Strongly disagree	245	1	14	5	7	2	7	35	7	1	7	5	52	2	2	1	4	10	6	32	17	2	17	6	3
Mildly disagree	376	3	9	15	11	2	9	38	9	8	17	3	87	8	3	9	17	8	10	50	12	2	18	19	9
Mildly agree	897	27	34	32	13	15	23	60	26	21	25	27	210	14	24	30	12	29	42	109	21	2	20	51	30
Strongly agree	507	25	13	15	1	8	8	10	6	26	13	36	151	7	26	21	9	16	23	35	4	3	5	21	25
Neutral	44	3	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	4	1	1	5	0	2	2	1	3	2	7	1	0	1	3	1

Assuming that institutional environment and professional development are interrelated, indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
New approaches ... are generally supported here																									
Strongly disagree	226	0	11	2	6	1	4	27	7	1	5	2	62	3	3	1	3	9	9	32	6	1	16	9	6
Mildly disagree	371	6	17	10	7	3	13	32	8	6	12	5	105	5	2	10	12	11	15	39	10	2	10	18	13
Mildly agree	805	25	28	29	13	13	20	67	23	19	24	24	188	15	12	37	14	22	24	88	27	2	26	45	20
Strongly agree	610	26	12	27	9	9	11	20	9	34	23	41	129	9	37	14	13	23	34	60	8	4	8	22	28
Neutral	63	3	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	17	0	1	1	1	1	1	16	3	0	2	8	0
Faculty and administration here are typically at odds																									
Strongly disagree	398	18	8	13	4	2	4	5	7	21	15	39	87	3	28	11	6	15	18	42	2	3	5	26	16
Mildly disagree	613	24	22	14	6	13	9	17	18	16	15	22	164	13	20	29	14	19	26	71	6	1	13	35	26
Mildly agree	565	10	24	27	13	6	16	53	11	15	26	7	139	10	6	17	13	13	16	60	20	0	21	22	20
Strongly agree	399	3	15	10	11	3	17	68	9	2	10	2	82	4	2	4	6	17	20	53	25	0	20	11	5
Neutral	107	5	3	5	1	4	1	5	3	6	1	4	31	1	2	1	3	2	4	10	0	5	2	7	1
An intellectual environment exists here																									
Strongly disagree	235	1	10	6	6	3	4	23	8	6	8	3	59	2	3	2	7	9	4	31	11	1	15	10	3
Mildly disagree	411	5	15	16	10	3	13	45	15	3	10	9	111	7	6	3	10	11	15	49	11	2	14	17	11
Mildly agree	903	33	33	27	14	13	23	61	16	26	31	31	212	15	24	28	21	27	29	103	23	4	23	51	35
Strongly agree	476	15	12	19	4	6	7	15	7	24	15	28	114	5	25	28	4	18	30	44	9	1	6	22	18
Neutral	59	6	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	2	2	2	12	2	1	2	1	1	4	9	1	1	3	1	1

Assuming that institutional environment and professional development are interrelated, indicate the extent to which you agree/disagree.

ALL RESPONDENTS	VC CS	BR CC	CV CC	D CC	DL CC	ES CC	G CC	JSR CC	JT CC	LF CC	ME CC	NR CC	NV CC	PD CC	PH CC	PV CC	R CC	SS CC	SW CC	T CC	TN CC	VCC SO	VH CC	VW CC	W CC
Sufficient opportunities for prof. development are made available here																									
Strongly disagree	324	2	17	4	7	2	2	37	7	5	4	5	103	2	4	5	5	7	8	48	6	0	16	23	5
Mildly disagree	472	3	19	11	9	1	14	32	12	4	9	12	143	4	1	24	5	13	14	69	14	0	18	31	10
Mildly agree	784	20	25	23	14	14	17	60	18	21	28	31	187	14	21	23	23	28	29	77	20	6	21	33	31
Strongly agree	457	33	10	29	4	11	15	18	10	29	25	24	59	9	32	8	9	15	28	34	14	3	4	13	21
Neutral	42	3	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	11	2	1	1	1	3	2	7	1	0	2	1	0
Professionals here are appreciated by supervisors for doing their jobs well																									
Strongly disagree	308	4	11	7	10	3	10	36	4	4	7	6	79	4	2	6	6	10	9	35	13	0	15	14	13
Mildly disagree	364	6	13	17	9	3	6	38	10	8	14	11	85	4	6	13	13	14	10	33	14	2	9	17	9
Mildly agree	726	17	22	23	10	9	26	55	19	16	23	19	190	12	17	25	15	16	24	80	16	5	27	37	23
Strongly agree	635	32	25	21	5	12	6	15	15	31	20	35	137	11	33	17	8	22	36	80	11	2	9	31	21
Neutral	45	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	14	1	1	1	1	4	4	7	1	0	1	1	1